UNITAS

Ecclesia "Clamat ad omnes ut revertantur et inserantur."—St. Augustine

INTERNATIONAL QUARTERLY REVIEW

Organ of the Association Unitas — English Language Edition

Vol. II — OCTOBER-DECEMBER, 1950 — No. 4

SALVATOR BUTLER, S. A.
Toward a More Universal Observance of the Chair of Unity Octave

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.
Imprudent "Irenicism"

EMIL HERMAN, S. J.
Piety, Terrain of Reunion

MARTIN JUGIE, A. A.
The Exercise of the Roman Primacy in the Orient at the Time of St. Leo the Great

CYRILL KOROLEVSKIJ
Some Information Concerning Societies for Assistance to Catholics of Oriental Rite (Conclusion)

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS
Some Reactions to the Dogma of the Assumption

BOOK REVIEWS

NEWS

INDEX FOR 1950

THE GRAYMOOR PRESS, PEEKSKILL, N.Y.

Imprimatur:

✠*Aloysius Traglia*

Archiepūs Caesarien. Vicegerens.

Ex Vicariatu Urbis, die 9 iv '49.

Toward a More Universal Observance of the Chair of Unity Octave

IT IS CLEAR to those who have reflected duly upon the divisions among Christians and have perceived the tragedy in the separation of many millions from the true Church, that prayer above all, and unceasing waves of prayer are wanted to impell a salutary return to the one communion of Christ's charity. Those who possess the true faith and know themselves to be obedient to Christ when they acknowledge His Vicar, are conscious of an infinite debt of gratitude for their solidarity with the powers of Heaven. What better expression of gratitude could they offer than supplications to the Giver of their gift of faith that He lead the "other sheep" also to the fold which shelters them?

The Chair of Unity Octave recurring each month of January offers the occasion for all Catholics to pray in unison for the return of our separated brethren. Each step toward a more thorough and universal observance brings with it new hope and marks a further advance in Christ's peaceful conquest. We take great satisfaction in signalling such a move which in these last months has arisen from the ranks of the clergy.

The Missionary Union of the Clergy, which has now become a vast organization, solidly established in more than fifty nations, and numbering over 340,000 priests among its members, held its third international congress at Rome in the Pontifical Gregorian University in the month of September. One of the principle themes discussed was the problem of the return of all separated brethren to the one true Catholic Church.

The following resolution was formulated:

Opera multiplicentur ut Fratres separati redeant ad unicam ac veram Christi Ecclesiam, et ut oves quae perierunt de domo Israel ad fidem perducantur; in omnibus paroeciis celebretur Octavarium pro Unitate (a die 18 *ad diem* 25 *mensis Januarii); insuper in Seminariis hebdomada aut saltem dies pro Oriente Christiano.*[1]

The above resolution emphasizes the significance of the Octave as bearing upon the Church's missionary endeavor, and is in perfect accord with the intentions of Father Paul Wattson, S. A. who founded it. By virtue of his gigantic faith and tremendous vision, Fr. Paul saw in this Octave a vessel for the ultimate achievement of Christ's Kingdom. Christ's conquest should be realized through first solidifying the Christian forces, through first banishing divisions among Christ's protagonists, for they are an offense to the Master, and a scandal before the heathen peoples. When Christians are of one accord—and this can only come about in a total acceptance of Christ's faith as He has confided it to the one Church of His establishment—then the spectacle of a united Christendom, of a sincere community of Charity, would present an irresistible argument to those first dissidents, the Jews, who failed in the beginning to accept the promised Messias, as it would to the pagan world.

The Chair of Unity Octave, as a week of prayer, is the means for obtaining a peaceful triumph among our separated brethren at home, and a vessel indicated by divine wisdom for obtaining that concord on the mission field which

(1) May efforts be multiplied that our separated brothers return to the one and true Church of Christ, and that the sheep that are lost of the house of Israel be led back to the faith; let the Octave for Unity (from the 18th to the 25th of January) be celebrated in all parishes; moreover let a Week or at least a Day for the Christian Orient be celebrated in the Seminaries.

would favor a successful evangelization of the millions who have not yet been blessed with the message of Christ.

The *Octave* has the approbation of the Roman Pontiffs since the time of Pius X, who first blessed it. Pope Pius XI, and after him Pope Pius XII, adopted the practice of opening the *Octave* by celebrating his own Mass for its intentions on the Feast of the Chair of St. Peter. Recently, its indulgences have been increased by the reigning Pontiff. It is celebrated with great solemnity at Rome, head and center of Christianity. Bishops in many countries, as dissimilar as the United States, Spain, Greece and India have sanctioned it and ordered its observance. Organized observances have become a general thing from the west to the east of the Christian world in cathedrals, parishes, seminaries, religious houses and schools. Perhaps it is not too hardy to say that it has already become a practice of the Universal Church.

UNITAS is justly convinced that the celebration of the *Chair of Unity Octave* is a response to a desire of the charitable heart of our Mother Church, and is an act of obedience to and saintly cooperation with Our Lord Jesus Christ Who first prayed *that they all may be one.* We recommend the *Octave,* or rather a still more fervent observance of it to all those who are dedicated to a triumph of Christ's divinely instituted unity throughout the world.

Salvator Butler, S. A.

Daily Intentions of the Chair of Unity Octave.

Jan. 18. *Feast of St. Peter's Chair at Rome.* The return of all the "other sheep" to the one Fold of St. Peter, the One Shepherd.

Jan. 19. The return of all Oriental Separatists to Communion with the Apostolic See.

Jan. 20. The submission of Anglicans to the authority of the Vicar of Christ.

Jan. 21. That the Lutherans and all other Protestants of Continental Europe may find their way "Back to Holy Church".

Jan. 22. That Christians in America may become one in communion with the Chair of St. Peter.

Jan 23. The return to the Sacraments of lapsed Catholics.

Jan. 24. The conversion of the Jews.

Jan. 25. *Feast of the Conversion of St. Paul.* The Missionary conquest of the world for Christ.

Imprudent "Irenicism"

UNITAS READERS will have noticed that the Sovereign Pontiff in his recent and extremely important encyclical, *Humani generis*, denounces among other errors a certain "irenicism"; namely, a certain manner of acting as regards our separated brothers, which cloaks itself in the beautiful name of peace (in Greek, eirénê), but which does not serve true peace. The following is the passage which demands the consideration of all those who work "pro-unione":

"There are many who, deploring disagreement among men and intellectual confusion, through an imprudent zeal for souls, are urged by a great and ardent desire to do away with the barriers that divide good and honest men; these advocate an 'irenicism' according to which, by setting aside the questions which divide men, they aim not only at joining forces to repel the attacks of atheism, but also at reconciling opposites in dogmatic matters." Then, a little further on: "But some, through enthusiasm for an imprudent 'irenicism', seem to consider as an obstacle to the restoration of fraternal union, tenets founded on the laws and principles given by Christ and likewise on the institutions founded by Him, or which are the defense and support of the integrity of the Faith, and the removal of which might bring about the union of all, but only in their common ruin."

There exists, indeed, an imprudent irenicism, and it is an easy matter to recognize it in the references to it which are made in the encyclical: It is that which attempts to effect a union of spirits to the detriment of truth. It either softens the dogmatic verities with such shadings that they appear to resemble more the "heterodox" beliefs, or it passes over in silence, or even puts in question principles and realities which are derived from Christ Himself. Not only is it not licit, but it brings about the opposite effect from the one intended. It seeks unity, indeed, but it is truth which unites and error which divides. In flattering error, it serves only to confirm or increase divisions. One never repeats too often: it is in proclaiming her privilege of being the sole spouse of Christ and messenger of integral verity that the Catholic Church keeps safe the possibility of a real union of all Christians. It is upon her terrain and within her unity that all will be able to become one.

Another tendency of this imprudent irenicism consists in throwing into high relief and even exaggerating the wrongs, the deficiences, and the faults of the Catholics, and in displaying only indulgence or admiration for the dissidents. What is the result of this manner of acting? One discourages the Catholics, and diminishes the splendor of the Church's history, while on the other hand he provides the non-Catholics with arguments for the justification of their past and for remaining fixed in their present position. Here again, conscientious respect for truth presented without bitterness nor acrimony, but also without weakness will sustain a legitimate pride among Catholics, and will present useful matter for reflection to others.

Genuine irenicism, prudent and moderate, is that which approaches our separated brothers with perfectly sincere charity, which in their regard never fails in the spirit of understanding and justice, and which strives in every way to dissipate the prejudice and bias of their views. Worthy of its name, it breathes only peace, but a peace inspired by the love of souls and which is enlightened by truth, a peace without defection and without confusion, an active and radiating peace tending to an ultimate possession in common of truth in its entirety.

CHARLES BOYER, S. J.

Piety, Terrain of Reunion

THE LATIN-RITE CATHOLIC will doubtless find that his first visit to a non-Catholic Russian or Greek church is a confusing experience. The high iconostasis hides the altar; the saints which he finds pictured all about him have a grave and austere demeanor; the ceremonies at which he assists seem strange and vastly unlike what he has known. He is impressed with the differences between the customs of the Oriental churches and those which are familiar to him.

If he has the opportunity of further experience among these surroundings, and with time forms a more personal and intimate contact with them, his sentiments are likely to change. He begins to feel that he is, indeed, in a Catholic world. Those angels, those prophets, those saints—he has known them from childhood. When he examines more closely the ancient icons which the people are venerating, they begin to hark back to those which he has known in so many ancient Catholic churches and pilgrimage sanctuaries. The altar which is the central point about which the entire edifice is built, is used for the same Sacrifice which is offered on the altar of his own church. The spirit of prayer which pervades this house of God, the solemn grace of the liturgical ceremonies and the spiritual fervor of the worshipers reach to the strings of his heart and sound a familiar chord.

This note of familiarity is readily accounted for: between Latin and Oriental piety there are no essential differences. It is true that learned dissertations have been written to describe different attitudes toward holy things. For example, the attitude of the orientals toward their icons is not the same as that of the Latin faithful toward their sacred images. We do not mean to question the correctness nor the utility of such studies, but we wish to point out that accidental differences are to be found even among the members of one and the same Church. The Englishman's piety differs widely from that of a Sicilian, yet both are Catholics, and often very fervent ones.

Identical beliefs are at the source of both Latin and Oriental piety. Both admit the inspiration of Sacred Scripture. Beyond this, our Oriental brothers recognize as we do that tradition is a source of faith. The great verities defined by the Councils of the universal Church throughout long centuries of common struggle for orthodoxy are admitted and loudly proclaimed both by Catholics and dissidents. The doctrines which divide them one from another are actually few in number and have to do rather with the exterior constitution of the Church: principally it is the primacy of the Roman Pontiff which the non-Catholic Orientals reject. But if these divergencies, exaggerated as they are by polemics —which often fail in charity—have been intensified to the point of dividing Christianity, fortunately, they do not attain *the piety of the faithful which remains the common ground where Catholics and dissidents can come to an understanding.*

In an Oriental church the central point, at the apex of the iconostasis, is reserved to a representation of the Holy Trinity. The cult of this august mystery penetrates the entire Oriental liturgy. Above all, it is the life and the mission of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity, the Word made Flesh, which arouses the piety of the faithful. The iconostasis, and often the frescoed walls and pillars of the churches evoke the whole life and passion of Our Lord and cause them to live again before the eyes of the Christian. There are even detailed regulations establishing the scenes which should be duly represented. Among these are the Annunciation, the birth of Our Lord, the presentation at the Temple, the

baptism of Jesus, the episodes of His public ministry, the Last Supper, and the passion and resurrection. It has been said of the Gothic church that it is the Bible of the illiterate. The same can be said of the Oriental churches which recreate the life of the Gospels and refashion the souls of those who frequent them according to that divine model.

One finds the Mother of God standing in the place of honour at the side of Our Lord. We have all heard of the overwhelming love and veneration of the Most Holy Virgin throughout the Oriental world. She is known there in many of the manifestations in which she is dear to the West. They also have the Immaculate Virgin, the Mother of Good Counsel, the Mater Dolorosa, and the like. The great veneration for the Blessed Virgin among the Byzantines, Russians, and other Orientals has given rise to various types of icons: the praying Virgin (without the child), the Virgin of Intercession (déisis), the Virgin who, along with St. John Baptist, intercedes for men to her Son; the *Hodigitria*, or the Virgin who shows the way; the Virgin of Compassion, or rather of caresses, as she is known, playing with her child; the Virgin of Consolation; the Virgin of the Passion, and still others. From this variety of icons spring ever new impulses of love and tenderness toward the Blessed Virgin.

Most of all the Latins and Orientals feel themselves at one in the firm belief in the eucharistic presence of Our Lord. For both the eucharistic sacrifice is the center of divine worship. For both it is Jesus Christ, the God-man Himself, Who offers Himself upon the altar in His humanity as an oblation of adoration, praise, and thanksgiving to the Most Holy Trinity, and as a sacrifice of propitiation and satisfaction for sinners. Outside of the Holy Liturgy, the non-Catholic Orientals do not know those forms of worship which the Catholics are accustomed to offer Our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament—visits to the tabernacle and processions. Yet even this devotion has not been totally unknown in the Orient. The Bishop Dimitri of Rostov, who died at the beginning of the eighteenth century, and who is an extremely popular saint in Russia, was particularly devoted to the Holy Eucharist. The beautiful prayers which he composed to be said before and after Holy Communion testify to this eucharistic devotion. It is told of him that when he made his pastoral visits, he would first go to the place where the Holy Species were reserved for the communion of the sick, and would remain for a time in adoration.

The non-Catholic Orientals have not generally adopted the forms of eucharistic worship that have arisen within the Western Church since the eleventh century. On the other hand, frequent communion remained in honour for a long time during the period of the Middle Ages, especially in monasteries. It is only in recent centuries that one finds a relaxation of this custom.

Usage, especially in Russia, has required of the faithful that they prepare for Holy Communion with a week of fasting, prolonged prayers, and works of mercy and mortification. This practice may not be favorable to the practice of frequent communion, but the seriousness with which the faithful undertake such a preparation is a beautiful testimony to their faith and piety. It should be remarked, however, that there are movements in favor of frequent communion in non-Catholic circles. In Greece, for instance, the Zoe (life) confraternity works in this direction. It is a very active group made up mostly of fervent laymen who devote themselves to preaching in the churches and to other apostolic activities.

It is by no means hard to see that this piety which we have in common constitutes a powerful motive for desiring ardently the return of our separated

brethren of the East, and their unity within the Church. First of all we are impelled by the *sorrow* we bear in not being able to join with them unreservedly in their manifestations of piety, in their profound love for the Blessed Virgin. There is no canonical hour of their Divine Office which does not address a *theotokion*, a hymn-like strophe, to the Mother of God; there is not a litany which does not invoke her powerful intercession for our needs; nor is there a church or chapel in which her icon does not occupy a privileged place.

Another reason for a vehement longing for the return of our separated brethren of the East is found in the *hope*, that this common piety inspires within us. We do not deny the divergencies and the opposing convictions. But if two persons love and venerate the same realities, and with a whole heart, there exists a strong hope that one day they will arrive at an understanding. There is something more. This hope is not merely based upon human aspirations, but upon something more cogent—it is based upon divine forces. Could it be supposed that we are not justified in a hope that the Mother of God, seeing her beloved sons divided in opposing camps, will have pity upon them and urge them back to concord and union? Neither should we forget that in Holy Communion it is the same Christ Who descends into our hearts—into ours and into those of our Oriental brothers. There are not two Christs, but one sole Christ, creator of the sacrament of unity, *Sacramentum unitatis*, by which He wishes to unite to Himself and one to another all those who receive Him worthily, so that we all may become *"corpus Christi et membrum de membro"*.

The unhappy division of Christians is an obstacle to the full efficacity of that august Sacrament of unity. While Christianity should present a spectacle of perfect union to the non-Christian world, its divisions constitute a stumbling block and a scandal. The *Chair of Unity Octave* has the purpose of recalling to all Christians the painfulness of separations between Christians and of reviving a zealous affection for all those who bear the name of the Lord. All cannot take an active part in the work of reuniting the separated Christians with the Church, but all are able to pray for this end, and to offer their sacrifices, be they large or small, for its attainment. They may make their own the sublime prayer for peace which the deacon intones each day in the Byzantine Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom:

"Let us pray to the Lord in peace.

"Let us pray to the Lord for peace from on high and the salvation of souls.

"Let us pray to the Lord for the peace of the entire world, for the prosperity of the holy Churches of God and for the union of all. Amen."

E. Herman, S. J.
Rector of the Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome.

The Exercise of the Roman Primacy in the Orient at the Time of St. Leo the Great

If one were to believe the greater part of anti-catholic polemicists of the East, the primacy of the pope—such as it has been defined by the Vatican Council—would be a creation of the late Middle Ages, having no serious foundation in the tradition of the first centuries of Christianity. This full, ordinary, immediate, and truly episcopal power over each and every member of the universal Church and this role of supreme judge over all ecclesiastical cases to which one can appeal the sentence of any tribunal (both of which were attributed by the Council to the Bishop of Rome, successor of St. Peter) would be unable to claim any precedent in the conduct of the ancient popes. In these latter days, however, this thesis has been abandoned by many historians and theologians of anglicanism and Russian "orthodoxy".

One may cite, among the former, many scholars belonging to the pro-Roman, anglo-catholic group, such as Dr. C. H. Turner in his article on *St. Peter and St. Paul in the New Testament and the Primitive Church* (1); Dr. Kidd in his book, *The Roman Primacy to A.D.* 461 (2); and S. Herbert Scott in *The Early Eastern Churches and the Papacy* (3) (a copy of which was offered to Pius XI). The savants declare that a profound knowledge of history makes the Protestant position untenable (4), and the anti-papal party is incapable of answering them. (5)

There have been similar affirmations from many Russian scholars at the beginning of our century from the years 1905-1914, during which time the Draconian censure of the ruling Holy Synod lost a little of its severity. Alexis Petrovitch Lebedev (1845-1908), *The Clergy of the Ancient Universal Church from Apostolic Times Up to the Ninth Century*, the tenth and last volume of his history of the Church, traces a chart of the development of the Roman primacy which one might believe was written by a Catholic pen. (6) He produces facts and testimonies which show that from the beginning the Bishop of Rome has been the true primate of the universal Church, that the oriental Churches and the ecumenical councils themselves bowed before his authority, and that this authority had already arrived at its height during the epoch of the Council of Chalcedon with St. Leo the Great. Another Russian historian of the Church, Basil Bolotov (1834-1900), deals especially with St. Leo. Although very hostile to the papacy, he has had the integrity to analyze impartially the doctrine of the great Pope on the primacy. His conclusion is this:

In the declarations of Leo the Great one finds already all the Roman prerogatives in the matter of jurisdiction *just as they have since been defined by the Vatican Council.* It can never become necessary to judge a Roman pontiff. He may have his deficiencies, but they are compensated for and corrected by the

---

1) Cf. *Theology*, August and October, 1926.

2) London, 1936.

3) London, 1928.

4) S. H. Scott, Ph.D., B. Litt., *The Anglican Church and the Center of Unity*, Oxford, 1930, p. 20: *"We must face history. But to be deep in history is to cease to be a protestant."*

5) Cf. Jacques Bivort de la Saudee, *Anglicans et Catholiques. Le problème de l'union romaine (1833-1933)*, Paris, 1948.

6) Dukhoventsvo drevnei vcelenskvi Tserkvi, Moscow, 1905, p. 228-229.

merits of Peter. Thus it appears that the Bishop of Rome could not fail seriously. (7)

The position of Bolotov is that Leo claimed all the privileges defined by the Vatican Council. But it is not only in words and in his writings that the great Pope clearly formulated and claimed the primacy of divine right over the universal Church. He taught this primacy in fact by his whole conduct and by a manner which leaves nothing to be desired. He exercised this primacy in actuality and especially over those Oriental churches which at the present time reject the primacy on the one hand while on the other they offer magnificent praises to Leo in their liturgy. It is this exercise of the primacy over the Oriental Churches by St. Leo that we wish to describe in the following pages, basing it solely on the Pope's correspondence with these churches. In order that the subject may not lead us too far and exceed due proportion we shall limit ourselves to the relation of certain minor events, and certain interventions of lesser importance concerning which neither the historians of the Church nor even the apologists of the Roman primacy usually speak. Among these interventions we will choose those which regard the great patriarchal Sees because they are more apt to impress our separated brethren and to demonstrate to them that the papacy is not a creation of the medieval West but an established fact which dates from the first ages of the Church.

We will classify these interventions under the following headings:

1. Interventions of a liturgical order.
2. Interventions of a disciplinary order.
3. Interventions of a doctrinal order.
4. Solicitude for information and exhortations to vigilance.

I. Interventions of a Liturgical Order.

From the beginning the popes were concerned with maintaining liturgical unity in the Church, at least in its main lines. A question of ritual, the date of the feast of Easter, gave rise to the first great manifestation of the Roman primacy under Pope Victor (189-199). That may surprise us a little, accustomed as we are to a diversity of rites and cultural usages. But the care of maintaining unity, even in this secondary sphere, testifies to great wisdom. The diversity of rites and of liturgical practices can, in fact, become a cause of dissension and furnish pretexts of rupture to the fomenters of schism. The history of the Byzantine Schism is proof. Accordingly, we see Pope St. Leo, in the midst of the Fifth Century, striving to safeguard or to establish uniformity in certain liturgical usages of the particular Churches.

The first letter addressed to an Oriental that we have from him is that addressed to Dioscorus, Bishop of Alexandria, dated the 21st of July, 444. (8) It deals with two liturgical questions. After recalling that most perfect accord should exist between the two Churches of Rome and Alexandria because both go back to the Prince of the Apostles and because it is not credible that St. Mark, the disciple of Peter, should have given Alexandria different rules from those his master had established at Rome, the Pope manifests his will of seeing the Church

---

7) *Lessons on the History of the Ancient Church*, Brilliantov's ed., Petrograd, 1913, vol. III, p. 285 (in Russian). See the chapters on the claims of the Bishop of Rome to the primacy in the universal Church, p. 273-319. Cf. Pietro Santini, *Il primato e infallibilità del Romano Pontefice in S. Leone Magno e gli scrittori greco-russi*, Rome, 1936; M. I. Herbigny, *Theologia de Ecclesia*, vol. II, Paris, 1928, p. 138-140. In his *Manual of Ecclesiastical Law (Utchebnik tserkovnago prava)*, 4th ed., Petrograd, 1912, p. 19-22, the Russian canonist, N. Souvorov, no longer has difficulty in recognizing that the popes of the first centuries exercised a true primacy of authority over the universal Church.

8) It is epistle IX in the edition of the Ballerini brothers who date it June 21, 445. Jaffe (*Regesta pontificum*, no. 406) places it on the 21st of July, 444. We cite the edition of Ballerini as it is reproduced by the P. L. of Migne, vol. LIV.

of Alexandria follow the Roman practice on two points: 1) the day on which Orders should be conferred; 2) the celebration of many masses in the same basilica on feast days when there is a great affluence of people in order that all the faithful may be able to assist at the eucharistic sacrifice. The ordinations of bishops, priests, and deacons should be held on the night of Holy Saturday or on the morning of Easter Sunday while those being ordained and those ordaining are still fasting. Leo explains the suitability of both observing the same day, and refers both to Scripture and tradition. He is not less explicit on the necessity of multiplying masses on feast days. It is not a mere desire that he expresses. In both cases he uses the expression, *a vobis volumus custodiri*, (9) but afterwards softens this imperative tone somewhat by more benign formulas. (10) We do not know how Dioscorus received the double demand of the Pope. Whatever his response, the intervention of St. Leo loses nothing of its significance in the history of the Roman primacy.

Even more significant is an intervention which is at the same time both liturgical and disciplinary. After the "Robber Council of Ephesus" (449) a grave question confronted the Pope. How should he deal with the Oriental bishops who had yielded before the threats and the violence of Dioscorus and had subscribed both to the restoration of Eutyches and to the unjust deposition of numerous prelates? In a first letter to Anatolius of Constantinople, dated the 13th of April, 451, St. Leo, ratifying the measures already taken by his legates, declared that he would be indulgent in regard to the repentent prelates who had been deceived or intimidated by Dioscorus. In regard to those who had been the leaders of the secret meeting—and the Pope names especially Dioscorus, Juvenal, and Eustathius of Beryte—Anatolius was to abstain from inscribing their names on the diptychs of his church (11). A little later, in another letter dated June 19, 451, the same Anatolius was advised that the Apostolic See reserved judgment to itself over the major culprits in case they made honorable amends and condemned their error. In the meantime their names were not to be recited in the liturgical offices. (12) Acting in this way, the Pope made a clear manifestation of his authority of universal primacy, his role of moderator of the ecclesiastical communion, and his right of reserving to himself certain major cases.

It is known that after the Council of Chalcedon numerous Oriental monks declared themselves for Dioscorus and Monophysitism. St. Leo learned that certain ones among them were going out preaching and leading the masses against the defenders of the Council. In order to cut short this abuse he reminded the

---

9) "Quod ergo a patribus nostris propensione cura novimus esse servatum, a vobis quoque volumus custodiri." *Epist. IX, ad Dioscorum, alexandrinum episcopum*, col. 626 C.

10) "Et ideo *pie* et *laudabiliter* apostolicis morem gesseris institutis, si hanc ordinandorum sacerdotum formam per Ecclesias quibus Dominus praeesse te voluit, etiam ipse servaveris." col. 626 A. "*Studiose* ergo dilectionem tuam et *familiariter admonemus*, ut quod nostrae consuetudini ex forma paternae traditionis insedit, *tua quoque cura non negligat*, ut per omnia nobis et fide et actibus congruamus." col. 627 A.

11) "De nominibus autem Dioscori, Juvenalis et Eustathii ad sacrum altare recitandis, dilectionem tuam hoc decet custodire, quod nostri ibidem constituti faciendum esse dixerunt, quodque honorandae sancti Flaviani memoriae non repugnet et a gratia tua christianae plebis animos non avertat. Nam iniquum nimis est atque incongruum eos qui innocentes et catholicos sua persecutione vexarunt sanctorum nominibus sine discretione misceri." *Epist. LXXX*, col. 914-915.

12) "De his autem qui in hac causa gravius peccavere . . ., si forte resipiscunt . . .; si satisfactis talis accedit quae non refutanda videatur, maturioribus Apostolicae Sedis consiliis reservetur, ut examinatis omnibus atque perpensis, de ipsis eorum actionibus quid constitui debeat esatimetur. Neque prius in Ecclesia, cui te Dominus voluit praesidere, cujusquam talium, ut ante jam scripsimus, nomen ad altare recitetur, quam quid de eis constitui debeat, rerum processus ostendat." *Epist. LXXXV*, col. 923-924.

bishops of the Orient and notably Maximus of Antioch (13) and Theodoret of Cyrus (14) that the office of preaching belonged to the bishops alone and not to the monks nor to simple laymen whatever their talents or their learning might be. He also wrote to Thalassius, bishop of Caesarea of Cappadocia, demanding that he silence a certain monk, George, who was promulgating heresy. (15)

It is necessary to point out, finally, the entire correspondence of the Pope concerning the date of Easter in the year 455. For a long time the Bishop of Alexandria had had the privilege of fixing and announcing to the Churches the date of the Paschal Feast according to the prescriptions of the Council of Nicaea. At Rome there was no difficulty about recognizing this privilege, but the Alexandrian computation was not to be accepted blindly. It was to be controlled. This had become clear toward the beginning of the year 455. There was a disagreement concerning this year between the Alexandrian computation, such as it had been established in the time of the Patriarch Theophilus, and the Roman calculation. On the 24th of June, 452, Pope St. Leo wrote to the Bishop of Lilybaeum, Paschasinus, who had been one of the pontifical delegates at the Council of Chalcedon, in order to point out to him the divergence between the two computations and to beg him to examine the question with his scholars. (16) At the same time he should interest the Emperor Marcian in the matter (17) and ask his own nuncio, Julian of Cos, to gather specialists for the study of the problem. (18) The Bishop of Alexandria, Proterius, at the Emperor's request, wrote a long letter to the Pope filled with technical details in order to justify the computation of Theophilus. (19) Leo was not convinced by all of these arguments but, as he himself wrote to Emperor Marcian in thanking him for intervening in behalf of Proterius he accepted the Alexandrian solution for the sake of peace and unity. (20) This small affair shows the solicitude of the Pope to maintain a uniformity of liturgical practice among the Churches.

II. Interventions of Disciplinary Order.

No one more than St. Leo manifested respect for the canonical rules universally received in the Church at his epoch. One might even find his declarations on the inviolability and perpetuity of the canons of Nicaea exaggerated. If he intervened directly at times in the internal government of particular churches, it was not for the pleasure of showing his primatial authority, but because the rights of justice or the integrity of the faith were at stake. Among these interventions we will cite two cases which concerned the Church of Constantinople under the episcopacy of Anatolius (449-458).

Towards the end of 450 two priests of Constantinople, Basil and John, who had been accused of heresy, went to Rome to clear themselves of suspicion.

13) "Illud quoque dilectionem tuam convenit praecavere, ut praeter eos qui sunt domini sacerdotes, nullus sibi docendi et praedicandi jus audeat vindicare, sive ille monachus, sive sit laicus, qui alicujus scientiae nomine glorietur." *Epist. CXIX ad Maximum Ant., 6*, col. 1045-1046 (June 11, 453).

14) "... statuentes ut praeter Domini sacerdotes nullus audeat praedicare, sive monachus, sive ille sit laicus, qui cujuslibet scientiae nomine glorietur." *Epist. CXX ad Theodoritum*, 6, col. 1054 (June 11, 453)

15) "Ad quem episcopum (Thalassium), si dilectioni tuae visum fuerit, ex hac parte competentia scripta mittemus." *Epist. CXVIII ad Julianum Coensem. epis.*, col. 1040 B (April 2, 453).

16) *Epist. LXXXVIII*, 4, col. 929.

17) *Epist. CXXI ad Marcianum imperatorem*, col. 1055-1058 (June 15, 453).

18 *Epist. CXXII ad Julianum*, col. 1058-1060 (June 15, 453). *Epist. CXXVII ad Julianum*, 12, col. 1072-1073 (January 9, 454).

19) *Epist. Proterii ad papam Leonem (Epist CXXXIII* inter leonianas), col. 1084-1094 (a little after April 4, 454).

20) "Litteras autem fratris et coepiscopi mei Proterii Alexandrinae civitatis episcopi me accepisse significo, quibus apud pietatem vestram de me consensione respondi: non quia hoc ratio manifesta docuerit, sed quia unitatis, quam maxime custodimus, cura persuaserit." *Epist. CXXXVII ad Marcianum*, col. 1100-1101 (May 29, 454).

They showed that they were neither Nestorians nor Eutychians and professed the doctrine taught by St. Leo in the *Letter to Flavian*. The Pope sent them back to Constantinople with a letter for Anatolius. The latter was asked to admit them to his communion since they were in communion with the Apostolic See. (21)

The other case is more delicate because it directly concerns the internal administration of the bishop and regards the recall of his decision on a member of his clergy. The following is the case.

A short time after the Council of Chalcedon, Bishop Anatolius—one does not know for what reason—removed the archdeacon Aetius from his position to replace him with the deacon Andrew who had been seen among the Eutychian party and whom Anatolius himself for this reason had, a short time ago, dismissed from the service of the altar. (22) The disgrace of Aetius had been veiled with a formality. In his case the well known adage, *promoveatur, ut amoveatur*, was realized. He was raised to the priesthood and relegated to a suburb of Constantinople where he was in charge of a church and a cemetery. For one who knows the role that in times past the archdeacon played in the diocesan administration, the promotion clearly assumed the character of a humiliating dismissal. Moreover, the sudden elevation of Andrew, the ancient Eutychian, risked a detriment to the true faith. It was bound to give scandal among the more orthodox.

Aetius himself was of proven orthodoxy. He had appeared in the position of notary to St. Flavian at the Synod of Constantinople in 448 which had condemned Eutyches and it was as archdeacon that he assisted at the Council of Chalcedon. However, there he played a role which could not have been a recommendation to St. Leo. It was on his request, in fact, though clearly inspired by others, that the fifteenth session of the Council, in spite of the protest of the papal legates, was held. It was at this session that the famous twenty-eighth canon (October 31, 451) was drawn up. The next day, at the sixteenth and last session, it was our archdeacon again who defended what had been done the previous day against the legates. But the Pope closed his eyes to this affair. It was sufficient for him to know that Aetius was firmly attached to the true faith in order to interest himself in his cause. Having been informed of the case by Julian, Bishop of Cos, his representative at the imperial court, he did not hesitate to intervene in order to have the deposed archdeacon restored to his office. He did it in a manner which was both the most efficacious and the least humiliating to Anatolius.

The latter then became cold toward the Pope who was waiting for an explicit adhesion to the condemnation of the twenty-eighth canon on the part of Anatolius. In order to make his dissatisfaction felt, St. Leo ceased to write to him. The affair of Aetius and Andrew occurring at this time would only increase the tension. In these circumstances the Pope saw only one means of dealing with the prelate. He addressed himself to the Emperor, Marcian, and the Empress, Pulcheria, requesting them to make the necessary remonstrances to the one whose orthodoxy they had assured when they had sought recognition of his election from the Apostolic See.

Many letters addressed to Julian of Cos exhorted him to use his influence to lead Anatolius to change his mind and repair the wrong done to Aetius. (23)

21) *Epist. LXXXVII ad Anatolium episcopum*, col. 926 (June 19, 451).
22) It is what St. Leo himself affirmed in a letter to Emperor Marcian: "Quod adeo obedienter visus est accepisse, ut Andream diaconum, eutychianae haereseos defensorem, a se indicaret esse dejectum." *Epist. CXI*, col. 1021 B.
23) *Epist. 113*, col. 1024-1025 (March 11, 453); *Epist. 117*, col. 1037-1039 (March 21, 453); *Epist. 127*, col. 1070-1073 (January 9, 454).

These procedures were not long in being crowned with complete success. Submissive to the imperial protests, Anatolius first had Emperor Marcian intervene with the Pope for the return of his good graces.(24) He himself, a little later, wrote a profoundly deferential letter to St. Leo informing him that he had satisfied all the Pope's orders and desires and that he never had had the intention of opposing him. At the same time he complained in a friendly manner that the Pope had suspended correspondence with him. Aetius had been restored to his position and Andrew had been excommunicated as all the other former adversaries of St. Flavian. He wrote:

> God forbid that I should make opposition to orders which had been given to me by letter... As soon as our Most Pious and Christian Prince had communicated to me the letters of Your Holiness, I hastened to conform to the desires which they expressed: *both the interests of common peace as well as simple propriety impelled me to it.* And the very reverend priest of our holy church, Aetius, has been reestablished in his former position and ecclesiastical dignity. It is he who administers with wisdom and prudence the business of our bishopric. In regard to Andrew whom we would not have ordained ourself but who was promoted according to regular order to the dignity of archdeacon, he has been separated from the Church with the adversaries of our father and bishop of saintly memory, Flavian, that is to say, with the very same ones who had made common cause with the perfidious Eutyches. It is true that they seemed to have given sufficient satisfaction for the deed by manifesting their repentance and subscribing to the Letter of Your Holiness. (25) *They will remain, however, in that state up to the time that you will decide on their lot according as it seems good to you.* In regard to the decree of the universal Council of Chalcedon in favor of the See of Constantinople, Your Holiness may be sure that I had no part in it so that I have peace and tranquillity since my youth. The venerable clergy of the Church of Constantinople took this initiative in accord with the religious bishops of our regions who insisted on the measure. *But all its efficacy and its confirmation have been reserved to the authority of Your Holiness.* (26)

It is impossible to discover a clearer example of the Bishop of Rome's universal jurisdiction and his right to mix immediately, when he judges it proper, in the internal administration of the particular Churches. St. Leo was touched by this full submission of Anatolius. He congratulated him and enjoined upon him to receive Andrew and the other adversaries of Flavian who had been excommunicated into his communion if they showed their orthodoxy and their regret for the past. If they took advantage of these conditions, Andrew and also a certain Eufratas were to be raised to the priesthood. (27)

---

24) "Praeceptioni itaque pietatis vestrae parere volueram et litteras dare ad episcopum supradictum (Anatolium), si priores, quas ad illum direxi, vel effectu rerum, vel scriptis ipsius proficere aliquid probavissem." *Epist. 128 Ad Marcianum augustum,* col. 1073-1074 (March 9, 454).

25) The *Letter to Flavian* on the Incarnation.

26) "Nam penitus absit ut eis ego quaecumque mihi fuissent mandata per litteras adversarer. Quia tamen piissimus et christianissimus princeps ... vestrae beatitudinis litteras mihi sublegit, ea statim quae continebantur eis ut placita vobis implevi; quod me facere vel communis pacis utilitas, vel quod decuerat hortabatur... Sic gestorum vis omnis et confirmatio auctoritati vestrae beatitudinis fuit reservata." *Epist. 132 Anatolii ad Leonem* (inter leonianas) col. 1082-1084.

27) "Quod ergo in Constantinopolitana Ecclesia quaedam in officiis clericorum correcta significas, ut et Aetium presbyterum in gratiam tuam affectionemque revocaveris et Andream ab archidiaconi actione submoveris, nobis placuisse rescribo." *Epist. 135 ad Anatolium,* col. 1096-1098 (May 29, 454).

III. Interventions of a Doctrinal Order.

Nearly all the interventions of St. Leo in the internal affairs of the Oriental Churches were motivated by a solicitude for maintaining the integrity of the Faith. If we have arranged certain ones among them under the heading of "Interventions of a Disciplinary Order" it is because the disciplinary elements excel the doctrinal character. Such was the case of Archdeacon Aetius. The interventions of which we are now going to speak are also of a disciplinary order but the doctrinal element in them is of more importance.

The first and most important came about on the occasion of the election of Anatolius as Bishop of Constantinople. The circumstances in which this election took place are familiar. The second Council of Ephesus, qualified by Leo as the "Robber Council" had just taken place. Dioscorus and the Eutychian faction triumphed under the influential protection of the Emperor Theodosius II. Flavian of Constantinople died as a result of the rough treatment he suffered during and after the secret meeting. It was necessary to appoint a successor to him. Dioscorus maneuvered to have one of his clerics, the priest Anatolius, elected, and he himself conferred episcopal ordination on Anatolius. According to custom the newly elected wrote to the Pope in order to notify him of his elevation and the solicit papal approbation. ([28]) His letter was accompanied by another of Emperor Theodosius supporting the request. It is remarkable that in these documents no allusion was made to the Eutychian controversy nor to what had passed at Ephesus. Anatolius, however, did not fulfill the requirement of presenting a clear and distinct profession of faith on the mystery of the Incarnation. Under these conditions St. Leo did not believe that he should recognize his election and admit him to communion with the Holy See before he furnished sure proofs of his orthodoxy. While waiting he abstained from responding to him and notified Emperor Theodosius and Empress Pulcheria about the formalities which Anatolius had to fulfill in order to obtain approbation and communion with the Apostolic See. To facilitate the accomplishment of these formalities the Pope despatched to Constantinople an embassy composed of two bishops, Abundius and Asterius, and two priests, Basil and Senator. Before these four legates and before all the clergy and the faithful of Constantinople, Anatolius was required to subscribe to the letter of St. Cyril of Alexandria to Nestorius which was approved by the Council of Ephesus and which was accompanied by texts of the Fathers on the Incarnation and, at the same time, he was required to subscribe to Leo's own letter to Flavian which Dioscorus had prevented from being read at the Robber Council of Ephesus. ([29])

When the Roman legates arrived at Constantinople Theodosius II had just died (July 28, 450). This event greatly facilitated the task of the Roman legates because the new Emperor, Marcian, who associated Empress Pulcheria with himself, showed from the beginning that he was very favorable towards orthodoxy. The Eutychian faction lost its protector at the imperial court when the eunuch Chrysaphios was executed. Bishop Anatolius then made no difficulty about submitting to the conditions laid down by the Pope. A council was assembled at Constantinople on the 21st of October, 450, and there, in the presence of

28) There remains a fragment of this letter: *P.L.*, vol. LIV, col. 853-856, *(Epist. LIII* inter leonianas).

29) "Cumque (Anatolius) a se hoc quod eidem profuturum sit expeti disiderarique cognoverit, catholicorum sententiis toto corde consentiat: ita ut sinceram communis fidei professionem absolutissima subscriptione coram omni clero et universa plebe declaret, apostolicae sedi et universis Domini sacerdotibus atque Ecclesiis publicandum." *Epist. 69 ad Theodosium augustum*, col. 890-892 (July 16, 450). See also, *Epist. 70 ad Pulcheriam augustam*, col. 893-895. The Pope also recommended his legates and their mission to the Archimandrites of Constantinople: *Epist. 71*, col. 895-896 (July 17, 450).

the legates and all the assistants, the successor of Flavian gave the required signatures. The original of the acts of this Synod have not come down to us, but recently there has been found an important fragment conserved in a Syrian translation. (30) Without delay Anatolius had these acts carried to Rome by a delegation composed of the priest Casterios and two deacons, Patricius and Aschepiadus. The Pope answered him, congratulating and approving what had been done. At the same time he gave instructions for the conduct to be followed in regard to the bishops who had transgressed at Ephesus. (31)

It was also zeal for the purity of faith which motivated the intervention of St. Leo against the priest Atticus of the diocese of Constantinople. Notified without doubt by Julian of Cos, the Pope brought to the attention of Anatolius the behavior of the latter's subordinate who, it seems, was openly defending the Eutychian heresy. Anatolius was to make a secret inquiry on his own part and to cut Atticus off from the Church if he was infected with the poison of heresy and showed himself rebellious to all correction. (32)

Three months later Anatolius had not yet taken any action against the offender. In a new letter Leo reproached his negligence in very sharp terms and insisted that the affair be cleared up as soon as possible. Atticus and also a certain Andrew (33) should be forced to profess clearly the Catholic Faith defined at Chalcedon under pain of excommunication. (34)

On the 21st of March, 458, the Pope wrote to the priests, deacons, and clerics of the Church of Constantinople exhorting them to remain firm in the faith and to avoid the company of the heretics. Atticus and Andrew were again pointed out as suspect of heresy and, as previously, deprived of the honor of the priesthood if they did not publicly condemn the Eutychian heresy and subscribe to the definition of Chalcedon. (35)

Meanwhile, Anatolius had responded to the Pope and showed himself somewhat vexed at the Pope's insistence on calling up the case of Atticus. (36)

---

30) This fragment was found by Fr. Mouterde and published in, *Mélanges de l'Université de Beyrouth*, vol. XV, p. 33-50.

31) "Gestorum, quae sumpsimus, seriem necessariis, sicut oportuit, munitam subscriptionibus approbamus." *Epist. 80 ad Anatolium* (April 13, 451).

32) "Licet famae perferrentium temere non credamus, tamen quia, ubi animarum causa agitur, locum diabolicis fraudibus studemus obstruere, *praemonemus dilectionem tuam, ut Atticum presbyterum, qui perhibetur Eutychianorum errorem apertis intra Ecclesiam disputationibus confovere, secreta primum disquisitione discutias*; ac si quid in corde ipsius de haeretici veneni permixtione repereris, aut corrigendo catholicum facias, aut ab Ecclesia necessaria severitate depellas." *Epist. 151 ad Anatolium*, col. 1122 (Sept. 1, 457).

33) This Andrew, who appeared in company with the priest Atticus as hostile to the definition of Chalcedon, is perhaps the same as the one whom Anatolius had raised to the dignity of archdeacon in place of Aetius and whom he had ordained priest even on the order of St. Leo because he had accepted the *Letter to Flavian*. See above.

34) "Jampridem dilectioni tuae scripsisse me recolo, ut in clero Ecclesiae tuae nullum eutychianae haeresi consentire patiaris: quoniam capitis periculum respicit, si quid saucium inveniatur in membris. Sed cum hoc nulla adhuc correctione purgatum sit, et Atticum presbyterum tuum ad eam insolentiam profecisse cognoscam, ut in Ecclesia contra catholicam fidem et Chalcedonensem synodum audeat disputare: cogor vehementius de tua dissimulatione causari. *Nam quod incommonitus facere debuisti, miror etiam post evidentia nostra scripta neglectum. Et ideo acrius moneo neque amplius dissimulandum esse protestor*, si hominem pestilentem ulterius in tua habendum communione credideris quem nos, si fieri potest, emendari malumus quam perire . . ." *Epist. 157 ad Anatolium*, col. 1133-1134 (Dec. 1, 457).

35) ". . . nisi prius hostilia dogmata propria voce ac subscriptione damnaverint et fidem chalcedonensi consilio roboratam in Ecclesia, populo christiano praesente, se professi fuerint secuturos, ordinis sui honore priventur." *Epist. 161*, col. 1143 (March 21, 458).

36) We do not have the letter of Anatolius, but St. Leo makes allusion to it in his response: "Lectis dilectionis tuae litteris . . ., intellexi tibi studium meae sollicitudinis displicere, qua secundum charitatem, quam tibi a nobis impendi experimentis plurimis approbasti, de cavendis his qui communis fidei adversarii dicerentur admonui . . . Neque in aliquo honorem tuum laesi, cui discutienda ea quae ad me erant perlata commisi." *Epist. 163*, col. 1146-1148 (March 28, 458).

The latter had sent a profession of faith to Rome which St. Leo judged was insufficient. In a letter to Anatolius dated the 28th of March, 458, the Pope demanded that the accused accept the dogma defined by Chalcedon without ambiguity and that his profession of faith, duly signed, be read before the faithful. If he refused he would be subject to the sentence of the Council against heretics. (37) Atticus doubtless felt it necessary to comply. Some weeks later Anatolius died (July 3rd, 458), and the correspondence of St. Leo is thereafter silent on the affair.

IV. Solicitude for Information and Exhortations to Vigilance.

St. Leo, we have said at the beginning, had a keen consciousness of his position as universal bishop and guardian over the Christ's entire Fold. His solicitude extended to everything which regarded faith, discipline, and cult. His zeal extended to prelates in the highest places as well as to the most humble faithful. All the members of the Church were his sons, and he was pleased to call them such irrespective of the diocese to which they might belong. (38)

In order to exercise this role of universal guardian the Pope had need of being informed as to what was going on in the particular Churches. Bishops had the duty of informing him on every important event, and on every major matter occuring in their dioceses. In his letters to the Oriental bishops, St. Leo often referred to the old ecclesiastical rule, noted by the historians Socrates and Sozomen, according to which *nothing final should be established without the assent of the Bishop of Rome.* (39) He never ceased asking his correspondents to write to him, to give him news of their church and to keep him informed on the doings of the heretics in order that he might take opportune measures for safeguarding orthodoxy. This solicitude for information is quite remarkable in him and constitutes one of the most indicative manifestations of the consciousness he had of his role as Primate and Head of the universal Church.

It was this need of being informed that inspired him to create the first nuncio in the person of Julian, Bishop of Cos. This prelate holds an important place in the correspondence of St. Leo. He had the duty of informing the Pope about everything that went on in the Orient and especially at Constantinople. He was recommended to the Emperor, to the Empress Pulcheria, to Anatolius. Julian was to use all his influence to bring about the triumph of the faith defined at Chalcedon against the proceedings of the heretics. He also had to stimulate

---

37) "Atticus presbyter, scripta mittendo dubiae fidei et professionis incertae, confirmavit magis quam diluit quidquid ad nos de eo fama pertulerat . . . Praedictus Atticus, ut ab omni suspicione contraria liber appareat quid in Eutyche anathematizet ac damnet, evidenter ostendat, et in damnationem erroris expressi remota omni dubtitatione subscribat: ita ut chalcedonensis synodi definitionem de fide . . . profiteatur se par omnia servaturum, adjecta subcsriptione propriae manus, quae in Ecclesia Christi christiano populo praesente recitetur." *Ibid.*, col. 1147-1148.

38) Except to bishops St. Leo gave the name, "Dearly beloved son" to his correspondents. See, for example, the salutation of the letter to Eutyches: *Dilectissimo filio Eutychi presbytero. (Epist. 20,* col. 713) Bishops received the name of "Brother". St. Flavian, Bishop of Constantinople, saluted the Pope with the title, "Most holy and beloved Father and the Concelebrant". *(Epist. 22,* col. 723; *Epist. 26,* col. 743).

39) See Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.*, II, 15. Sozomen, *Hist. Eccl.*, III, 8, also declares that there exists an ecclesiastical law according to which *that which is done without the consent of the Bishop of the Romans is without value.*

the zeal of the too indolent Anatolius and to stir up opportune interventions on the part of the Emperor in favor of orthodoxy. (40)

Leo put into practice very well the *"confirma fratres tuos"* of the Gospel. It showed itself in all the interventions we have noted concerning the oriental clergy during the Eutychian controversy. One must add numerous exhortations to vigilance, admonitions addressed to prelates in the highest places (notably to the Bishop of Constantinople, Anatolius), to the Byzantine clergy, the Alexandrian clergy, and the monks of Palestine. He did everything he could to stop the progress of the monophysite heresy and to make triumphant the dogma defined at Chalcedon. He kept all parts of the Church under his observance, even the furthest away. As an example of exhortation mixed with admonition, such as a superior alone could write to an inferior, one may cite passages of his letter to Anatolius, dated October 11, 457 and also to Gennadus, his successor, dated June 17, 460. (41)

Conclusion

It is useless to multiply citations. The facts which we have taken from the correspondence of St. Leo have shown us a Pope of the Fifth Century exercising a truly episcopal power over the universal Church and placing himself alone the power of the single bishops in these dioceses. Between this Pope and the Popes of our day there is no essential difference in conduct. The differences do not regard the nature itself of the authority which is exercised but the modalities of its exercise. These are altered and diversified throughout the centuries according to the needs of time and place. The means of information above all have been perfected and organized. In order to have news about the Catholic world the popes of today are no longer at the mercy of far away and occasional correspondents. St. Leo had a nuncio, legates, and apostolic delegates, but he lacked Roman Congregations, *ad limina* visits, quinquennial reports. One may say that he called forth these institutions of the future with his desires, so keen was his wish to be informed on all sections of the one fold in order to be able to fulfill his charge of universal guardian.

M. Jugie, A.A.

40) We can only give some references here. When the affair of Eutyches broke at Constantinople, Leo was astonished at the slowness with which the bishop, Flavian, informed himself about it. He had already received the appeal of Eutyches and was waiting with impatience for the report of his bishop: "Miramur fraternitatem tuam quidquid illud scandali fuit nobis silere potuisse, et non potius procurasse ut primitus nos insinuatis tuae relationis instrueret . . . Quam plenissime et lucide universa nobis, *quod ante facere debuit* indicare festinet." *Epist. 23*, 1, 2, col. 731, 733. The same reproach is in *Epist. 24*, 2, (col. 736) to the Emperor. Writing to Theodoret, June 11, 453, the Pope said: "In hoc quoque tuae vigilantiae sollicitudine volumus adjuvari, ut tua relatione currente quid apud illas regiones doctrina dominica proficiat, apostolicam sedem festines instruere." *Epist. 129*, 6 col. 1054. In a letter to Maximus of Antioch he also wrote on the 11th of June, 453: "Summa itaque vigilantia cautum te esse convenit, ne quid sibi haeretica pravitas audeat vindicare, cum te deceat his sacerdotali auctoritate resistere nosque saepius de profectu Ecclesiarum tuis relationibus quid agatur instruere." *Epist. 119*, 3, col. 1041. A similar recommendation he addressed to the Bishop of Alexandria, Timothy Solofaciol: "Cum scribendi opportunitates, quibus fraternitas tua utatur, existerint, sicut necessarie et ex more fecisti . . ., ita omni tempore in hoc officio perseveres, et de provectibus pacis saepe, quantum fieri potest, sollicitudini nostrae mittantur indicia." *Epist 171*, 2 col. 1215-1216 (August 18, 460).

41) *Epist. 155*, 2, col. 1126 B and *Epist. 170*, col. 1214.

Some Information Concerning Societies for Assistance to Catholics of Oriental Rite (Conclusion)

XIII. The Spanish "Obra Misional Del Oriente Cristiano" (1941)

We have spoken of Father Augustine von Galen's attempt to extend the organization of the *Catholica Unio* to Spain, an attempt which did not succeed. We only know that His Eminence Enrico Reig y Casanova had hardly been promoted from the See of Valencia to that of Toledo and created Cardinal when he inaugurated a *Pia Unio pro Oriente dissidente,* which some of the Bishops wished to be merely national in character. We know furthermore that the *Junta Misional Claretiana* had begun to publish a leaflet concerning the Octave for Union. This is all that we have been able to learn concerning oriental activities in Spain in the past.

In 1941, Fr. Santiago Morillo, S.J., of oriental rite, Rector of the Pontifical College of Dubno in oriental Poland, was constrained by the events of the war days to return to Spain. He was named professor in the theological Faculty of the Company of Jesus at the civil University of Granada and layed the first foundations of the *Obra misional del Oriente cristiano* (OMDOC).

The scope envisaged by the OMDOC is to make known the oriental problems in Spain, Portugal and the Latin American countries, and to arouse interest and assistance in favor of Union. In fact, those nations, principally Brazil and Argentina, have received a great number of oriental rite emigrants: Slavs, Syrians and Lebanese. While the dissidents organize freely, the Catholics are obliged to deal with the hierarchy and the local clergy, to whom up to the present time, these problems are completely foreign, and who are still not properly familiar with the necessity Orientals have of preserving their proper rite wherever they may be. It often happens that, deprived of priests of their own confession, dispersed in immense regions, lacking any desire, at least in the first generation, of frequenting the Latin churches, the Catholics who are not grouped in the principal centers fall into religious indifference and pass over to the dissidents. Likewise it is not a rare thing to find young clerics in the Brazilian Seminaries, for example, coming from mixed families, who hardly remember what their origin is, who hardly know a word of their parent's language, and who nevertheless have excellent vocations. Evidently, if these oriental emigrants do not form compact centers similar to those of the Ruthenians in Western Canada, the natural law of assimilation will act as it does everywhere, and these minorities will be rapidly absorbed. In the meantime, however, it is absolutely necessary to keep in their rite those who are not yet absorbed, or who have the intention of maintaining their own traditions in the New World. The salvation of souls is involved, and no one may be constrained to change rite. It is also necessary to avoid the accusation so often made, and confirmed at times by appearances, that the Roman Church desires only to Latinize and absorb. One must also take the attitude that Bolshevism is not eternal: no one can forsee the moment in which the doors to the immense Russian nation will be opened. Not a few emigrants will

return there, and if not all converts, at least many will be souls well disposed with regard to a Union which will come about almost of itself.

The OMDOC has in fact the aim of arousing interest in the oriental religious question among all Spaniards, Portuguese and Americans of the Central and Southern parts of the Continent. This organization uses all the means of the modern apostolate to attain its end: publication of leaflets and pamphlets on Union, celebration of the oriental Liturgy throughout Spain, expositions of oriental art, unionistic conferences. In fine, it carries on an activity of intense popular propaganda, the necessary prelude to a more concrete and more systematic activity in a country which has remained up to the present time at the fringes of the unionistic movement, in spite of its tradition —in spite of what Cardinal Luis Belluga y Rancada (1662-1743) had done in the eighteenth century at Rome in favor of the Orientals; in spite of the foundation of *Pensions of Spain,* generously donated by the former Catholic Kings have contributed to the formation of a famous collection of Greek manuscripts to various needy Orientals, and notwithstanding the debt of gratitude which Catholic Spain owes to not a few Greeks who have contributed to the formation of a famous collection of Greek manuscripts at the Escorial, not to speak of the dominion of the Alugavares in medieval Greece, so well illustrated by Schlumberger.[1]

Fr. Morillo has given this Spanish oriental movement a clearly universal character. He has succeeded in creating dependent centres in the provinces, with the benediction and the aid of the Bishops. He has succeeded in correlating the activity of the missionary organizations of the JEM (*Juventud Espanola Misionera*) and the CMDE (*Confederation Misionera de Estudiantes*), and recently found the way to found an Association of promoters. This Association synthesizes the whole of the present movement of the OMDOC: study, propaganda, prayer. Study is carried on in special circles which are being formed, not only in the ecclesiastical Seminaries, but also in the Colleges and sections of Catholic Action. For this purpose, Fr. Morillo has published a book: *Las Iglesias critianas de Oriente,* and a liturgical booklet. Prayer is carried out especially in the Oriental Days of the month of January: Chair of Unity Octave, Oriental Day. The Octave is solemnly or privately celebrated in the whole of Spain and the faithful take part in great numbers, often with the Bishop presiding. The Oriental Day has already been realized as a true conquest in Spain, since all Seminaries and many Colleges and Associations observe it. A deeply moving pious practice has also been propagated—that of asking the reestablishment of union among his faithful on the same day and the same hour in which the Savior made this prayer: "That all may be one, even as Thou, Father, in Me, and I in Thee."

The OMDOC since 1944 has had its proper organ, *Oriente,* a popular periodical, well printed with colored inks, richly illustrated with brilliant colors according to the popular Spanish taste. A periodical of more scientific character has been projected.

It must be added, in praise of the OMDOC, that is has been able to achieve such great popularity that it can be counted upon for any meeting whatsoever of a missionary or religious sort. Recently it has been called to the direction of the Department of Oriental Europe which is about to commence its work in the *Consejo Superior de Investigaciones cientificas.* In like manner it

1. *Expedition des Almugavares ou Routiers catalans en Orient de l'an* 1302 *l'an* 1311, *Paris,* 1902

has been charged with the religious assistance and the spiritual direction of the oriental refugees among the university students in Spain. There are many of these almost all of oriental rite. A chapel of Byzantine rite and Slavic language has been prepared for them at Madrid, Serrano 121.[2]

XIV. Other Recent Institutions

Comite de Ste. Anne for the Melkites (1882); Society of St. Josaphat (Ruthenian—1926); Society of St. John Chrysostom (English—1926); Commission for Russian Relief (German—1927); Italian Catholic Association for the Christian Orient (1929); popularizing periodicals.

Victor Leburier (1832-1918), a priest of the diocese of Orleans, professor of the major Seminary of that city, later honorary canon, had made himself propagator of a more common life for the secular clergy inspired by that of the *Oblates* of St. Charles Barromeo and of the *Secular Clerics Living in Common* of the Venerable Bartholomew Holzhauser (1613-58). He was the founder and the Director General of the *Union apostolique des prêitres seculiers* with center at Paris. On pilgrimage to Jerusalem in May 1882, he made the acquaintance in the Holy City of the Latin Patriarch Vincenzo Bracco, a truly holy man and of apostolic zeal, as well as the Melkite Patriarchal Vicar Ignace Mu'aqqad, another holy man who at the time was spiritual director and confessor of the nascent Seminary of Santa Anna for the Melkites, later Bishop of Baalbek, who later resigned because of continual vexations which he had to suffer from an aggressive family of his eparchy. He became titular Metropolitan of Laodicea and retired to Harissa in Lebanon, where he founded the Missionary Society of Saint Paul, today flourishing, and then died in the odor of sanctity.

Lebeurier also visited Damascus and for some days was the guest of the Patriarch Gregory II Sayyûr. He had opportunity of observing that both in the Latin Patriarchate of Jerusalem and in the Melkite Patriarchate of Damascus the secular clergy lead the common life. This is, moreover, general among the Melkites where a number of priests find themselves engaged in the same ministry, whatever it might be. He traveled through Galilee where he could learn at first hand the impoverished state of the Melkite Churches of that time, of the futility of attempting to lead the dissidents back to Unity by means of the Latin clergy, and this through the avowals of the same Latin Pastors. The organ of his *Union* was a small periodical, *Etudes, ecclesiastiques sur les devoirs du sacerdoce et du ministere pastoral.* When he returned to France he published some articles which were later printed together in a pamphlet.[1] In these he recounted the story of his journey and proposed the foundation of an institution in favor of the Catholic Melkites. It was his desire that it be called the *Comite de Sainte Anne* in memory of the Seminary which had so greatly edified him. However, shrewder than Giard and Baudicour, although he knew neither one nor the other, he first came to an understanding with the General Direction of the *Oeuvre des Ecoles d'Orient,* and precisely on the basis proposed by the Propaganda to Baudicour, and which the latter had rejected. Article 4 of the brief Constitution states, *'Le Comite de Ste.*

2. Concerning OMDOC, see also *Unitas* I, 1946 (Italian ed.) pp. 87-89.

1. *Appel a la charite de la France pour le relevement de l'Eglise grecque catholique en Orient et la conversion des schismatiques* (sic), Paris, —?, 1882, 8; p. 31.

Anne versera dans la caisse generale des Ecoles d'Orient la totalité de ses recettes, dont il indiquera et fixera la destination."

In fact, the accounts published in the Bulletin of the *Oeuvre* speak only once of the *Comité de Ste Anne,* and this on the occasion of the exercise of 1887.[2] Besides sums paid to the general fund of which the total is probably found under the heading *Paris,* one finds that 5,370.65 Francs were sent directly to the interested parties.

It is not possible to state precisely when the *Comité de Ste. Anne* ceased to carry on its beneficent activity. At any rate, it was a fine example of concordant efforts and union for a particular end.

The *Unio ucrainica Religionis* of Vienna, as has been said above, was absorbed in the Catholica Unio. In 1926, the quite numerous Ruthenians of the Austrian Capital formed the Society of St. Josaphat which had exactly the same scope, but with action limited to the Archdiocese of Vienna. Its seat was in Vienna I, Riemergasse, 10. It subventioned a number of students. It is not known whether it is still in existence.

The attempts of the Anglicans to unite with the non-Catholic Byzantines are well known. Various Anglican societies deal with the problem, and a special periodical, *The Christian East,* a very well edited magazine, is devoted to it. London is the seat of the Exarchs of the Ecumenical Patriarchate of Constantinople for western Europe. It possesses one magnificent Greek church, and another Russian one. Up to the beginning of this century, the English Catholics, absorbed by their internal problems, had never interested themselves in the oriental religious question. In January, 1908, on the occasion of the fifteenth centenary of the death of St. John Chrysostom, the solemn pontifical Liturgy was celebrated in the Aula of the Beatifications in the Basilica of St. Peter with the participation of Pius X. It made a great impression and suggested the idea of giving greater luster to the international eucharistic Congress (which was to be held in the English capital a few months later) with a Liturgy in Byzantine rite and Greek Language. As a matter of fact, the Liturgy was celebrated by the Archimandrite Arsenius 'Atiyyeh, Rector of the Melkite Church of Paris, with the participation of a certain number of concelebrants. For this occasion a temporary iconostasis was erected in the vast cathedral of Westminster. It was the first time that the mass of English Catholics assisted at a Liturgy in oriental rite and the first occasion they had to become aware that the Catholic Church is not exclusively Latin. However, they had to wait until 1926 to assist at another manifestation of the same sort, again in the Cathedral of Westminster, and with a splendid movable iconostasis to permit the celebration of a Liturgy. It was in Slavic language this time, on the occasion of the closing of a Congress of studies on the Oriental Church held from October 26 to 30. The promoters were a few zealous English Catholics whose travels and personal studies had brought them in contact with the oriental Christian world. These were Sir Stuart Coats, Mr. C.S. Cosby Oakes, Mr. Donald Attwater, Mrs. C. Leigh-Smith and some others. The Society of St. John Chrysostom came into being at this time, under the honorary presidency of Cardinal Francis Bourne, Archbishop of Westminster. The Chairman, (and actual director) was Canon Edward Myers, from 1932 titular Bishop of Lamo and Auxiliary of the Archbishop. In 1927 Miss Harriet Urquhart founded at Rome the *Christian East Study Circle* with lectures

2. July number, 1888, p. 311.

for English speaking people at Rome, while Miss Gertrude Robinson, a graduate of Girton College of the University of Cambridge, patiently deciphered the cartulary of the Italo-Greek monastery of Sts. Elia and Anastasio of Carbone which she later published (*Orientalia Christiana*, 44, 53, 62: 1928-1930). In 1936, Dom Bede Winslow, O.S.B., of the Abbey of St. Augustine at Ramsgate founded, (and has perserved until now) the *Eastern Churches Quarterly*, in collaboration with Mr. Donald Attwater. It is the continuation of a special number of *Pax* which from 1931 has been dedicated once a year to the Christian Orient. *Pax* is the organ of the Benedictines of Caldey-Prinknash, who, as is well known, came to Catholic monasticism from Anglicanism. This conversion stirred up no little commotion at its time (1913). *The Eastern Churches Quarterly* takes the middle course between the scientific review and the magazine of popularization. It continued to appear even during the war. It is not properly the organ of the Society of St. John Chrysostom. It has the merit of corresponding in a Catholic sense to the Anglican *Christian East*. As regards the Society of St. John Chrysostom, its activity is limited for the present to interesting intellectual Catholic circles of England in the oriental unionistic problem. In addition, it could be noted that Miss Anna Christitch, a Serbian Catholic living at London, took part in the Congress of Velehrad in 1924. Also the opening of a Russian Catholic chapel is projected at London.

The idea of the *Italian Catholic Association for the Christian Orient* (*Associazione cattolica italiana per l'Oriente cristiano*) was launched for the first time in October, 1928, by a Sicilian professor, Pietro Mignosi. Inspired by the Encyclical *Rerum orientalium* of the preceding September 8, he had in mind only a circle of studies. The project found a response and found promoters among the Italo-Albanese of Sicily, especially in Dr. Rosolino Petrotta di Piana and Msgr. Luigi Lavitrano, Archbishop of Benevento who immediately founded in his Seminary a chair of oriental studies according to the recommendation of the Encyclical. He became Archbishop of Palermo on September 29, 1928, and Cardinal of the Holy Roman Church on December 16, 1929. He had a large part in the founding of the Association. The national director is at the present time the Italo-Albanese Bishop of Piana dei Greci, Kyr Giuseppè Perniciaro, with the Archimandrite Isidoro (Croce) of St. Mary of Grottaferrata near Rome. There is a delegate in each diocese, and promoters give lectures in the Seminaries from time to time. Oriental Weeks and extraordinary celebrations have been organized. According to the instructions of the Sacred Congregation for Universities, the professors of the Pontifical Oriental Institute of Rome have edited an excellent manual to aid the lectures for the Oriental Days to be held in the Seminaries. This manual which was published with the title of *Incontro ai fratelli separati di Oriente* (Roma, 1945) contains a series of conferences to be held during the annual cycle. The seat of the Association is located among the dependencies of the Eparchy of Piana dei Greci, Piazza Bellini, 2, Palermo. In 1936 and 1937 the Association published a year-book. In 1936, the zealous pastor of Bibbiano in the diocese of Reggio Emilia, Msgr. Caesar Spallanzani, began the publication of a bimonthly periodical of a popular nature called *L'Oriente cristiano e l'Unita della Chiesa*, unfortunately interrupted in November 1943 because of the war, and substituted in March 1946 in more scientific dress by *Unitas*.[3]

3. To which Msgr. Cesare Spallanzani generously donated his equipment. Cf. Unitas I 1946, (Italian ed.) p. 82

Besides the periodicals listed above, all depending upon the various Associations, and prescinding from those purely scientific, and from a few bulletins published by one or another religious iinstitution having an oriental branch, three publications of special importance should be noted. The oldest is a tranformation of the *Missions des Augustins de l'Assomption* sent to benefactors alone, under the title of *Union des Eglises*. It was changed to *Unité de l'Eglise* from 1933 to 1937. First a quarterly, it became bi-monthly (Maison de la Bonne Presse, 5, rue Bayard, Paris. VIII). It is a popular periodical, but contains also documents or articles of such a nature as to interest scholars also. The press crisis of 1938 in France obliged the suspension of this publication. The second, bi-monthly, was published in Polish at Warsaw under the title of *Oriens* (1933-1939). It was founded and directed by one of the best apostles of Union of our times, Fr. Jan Urban, S.J. (1874-1940). It was designed to make known precise information and correct ideas on the Orient among the educated Polish public. In this it succeeded excellently and to such a degree that it was sought also by the non-Catholic clergy. It had to be suspended for reasons of the war. The fate of Fr. Urban's specialized library is still uncertain. The third, entitled *Russie et Chrétienté*, was begun in 1934 by the Dominican Centre of *Russian Studies Istina* (Truth). Its seat is located at the present time at Boulevard d'Auteuil 25, Boulogne-sur-Seine. In the beginning it appeared in small format. It was obliged to appear in non-periodical fascicules during the German occupation of France. It was enlarged in format and bulk in 1946 and was transformed into a documentary review, not of mere erudition or of mere popularization. It is important not only for its articles, but for its very detailed and exact news section on the religious movement inside and outside of Russia.

CONCLUSION

XV. Hope for a Central Organization with Seat at Rome

As many as eighteen institutions have been accounted for in the preceding pages, of which about a half are still flourishing. There is a thought which of itself comes to mind after such an account: Would it not be more advantageous to have one single organization for the Christian Orient—Greek, Semitic, Rumanian, Slavic, Georgian, Armenian, Indian—to be centralized at Rome, under the control and supreme direction of the organism which for this portion of the Mystical Body of Christ, the invisible Head of the Church, would assume the functions of almost all the other Roman Congregations? It would be an organization similar to that which is today Pontifical, of the Propagation of the Faith, born in France, which provides for the needs of all the missions.

Everything today tends toward unity. Air traffic, electricity and its applications, and atomic energy have eliminated distances. In the Middle Ages, when the Tartar *Ilkhan* and the Roman Pontiffs sought to correspond with one another, all of three years were required for a letter from Rome to arrive at Karakorum and an answer to return. Today, in few short spans and in a very few hours of flight, both letters and travelers go from Washington to the oil wells of Iran, or from London to Kurachee. Twice now the great international conflicts have become world wars. Any future war could very soon engulf the whole planet, and the air-carried armies would pass across the poles. The idea of great united states analogous to those of North America goes ever further ahead as a solution for the reconstruction of Europe. The idea of a world parliament has been contemplated and earnestly desired. An inter-

national union of academies already exists. The study of cures for certain diseases is pursued through Congresses composed of delegates from almost all the civilized nations. The analogies could be multiplied. In the meantime, Bolshevism which denies not only God, but also the idea of fatherland, is bent upon a universal expansion under the control of a Third Rome which would not be that dreamed of by the Russian thinkers of the sixteenth century.

Meanwhile, we should be ready to aid our separated brothers who are not responsible, and therefore not guilty of a schism which they did not perpetrate, and which remains even unknown in the immense majority of cases. We should be ready to reconstruct and put into condition their houses of worship, just as Pius XI of saintly memory offered in 1923 to buy back from their confiscators the sacred vessels for churches in which his name was not even commemorated. In like manner, the Pontifical Commission, sent by him, provided the *prosfornitsy* with wheat for the making of eucharistic breads, and without giving thought to the fact that in the sacrifices thus celebrated, he, the donor and Vicar on earth of the divine Head of the Church, would not be mentioned. Already not a few priests in a Church which is not ours use the Slavic liturgical books printed at Rome which have been carefully revised by the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church, and in which the name of the Pontiff of Ancient Rome appears in all the *ektenias*. The Propaganda did not act otherwise when, about 1880 it placed many copies of the Syriac Missal, (imperfect as it was, printed by the Propaganda a half century earlier) at the disposition of the Jacobites of India. This breath of view has borne its fruit. Today the Catholic Church numbers three Bishops and fifty thousand faithful, all converts on the Malankar coast. Such fraternal aid accomplishes more in the way of reconcilation of all Christians than polemics—now of little use—on the procession of the Holy Spirit, the azymes, and Purgatory. Indeed all the dissidents already admit Purgatory in fact, rejecting merely the term, and this is a matter of little importance. Excepting for the divine Primacy of the Roman Pontiff, badly understood rather than denied, there is very little that really separates us from the dogmatic point of view. But we do hold in common a whole patrimony to be defended: in the first place the existence of God and of the Savior, and the liberty of man.

Until Union becomes an accomplished fact, even while proceeding in this wise, we must consider our Catholics and provide them with churches, priests, sacred vestments and vessels, books, and everything. Immense sums are needed for this, but if it is true that money is the thing which is least lacking in this world, it is still necessary to collect it, and to distribute it according to need, without one having an abundance while the other perhaps suffers total want. This cannot fail to happen when the centers of assistance are isolated, each one working on its own, without a common direction.

Among the existing institutions for Orientals, there are three which have already reached a great measure of expansion. It would be the duty of the Supreme Authority to choose which one could best correspond to the purpose. The seat of such an institution should, as is evident, eventually be transferred to Rome, as were the Propagation of the Faith, the Holy Infancy, the Institute of St. Peter Apostle for the formation of indigenous clergy—which has never forgotten the oriental clergy. It should be provided with an *international* Council similar to those mentioned above. In this council representatives of the different particular churches would have the faculty of being

heard, but without deliberative suffrage. Such active participation is not at all necessary and is perhaps useless if one would safeguard impartiality.

This is the idea, a purely academic one indeed, which has suggested itself while collecting the elements of the present study: it is the part of others to make the decision.

Cyrill Korolevskij

Comments and Documents

Some Reactions to the Dogma of the Assumption

His Holiness Pope Pius XII on November 1 proclaimed the corporal assumption of Mary into Heaven as a dogma. The proclamation was made to a vast assembly of Cardinals, Patriarchs, Archbishops, Bishops and faithful, come from every corner of the Catholic world to assist at this memorable festivity. It was perhaps the largest and most representative Catholic gathering that can be remembered in the Eternal City.

TEXT OF THE SOLEMN DEFINITION

Quapropter, postquam supplices etiam atque etiam ad Deum admovimus preces, ac Veritatis Spiritus lumen invocavimus, ad Omnipotentis Dei gloriam, qui peculiarem benevolentiam suam Mariae Virgini dilargitus est, ad sui Filii honorem, immortalis saeculorum Regis ac peccati mortisque victoris, ad eiusdem augustae Matris augendam gloriam et ad totius Ecclesiae gaudium exsultationemque, auctoritate Domini Nostri Jesu Christi, Beatorum Apostolorum Petri et Pauli ac Nostra pronuntiamus, declaramus et definimus divinitus revelatum dogma esse: *Immaculatam Deiparam semper Virginem Mariam, expleto terrestris vitate cursu, fuisse corpore et anima ad caelestem gloriam assumptam.*

The Bull *Munificentissimus Deus* assures the faithful that the definition is a response to the belief and the desires of the universal Church. He explains that the two privileges of Mary, the Immaculate Conception and the preservation from the corruption of the flesh in the tomb are closely connected. Hence, a movement to obtain a dogmatic definition of this second privilege commenced with the definition of the former. He says,

"In fact there were seen not only individual members of the faithful, but also representatives of nations or ecclesiastical provinces, and even not a few Fathers of the Vatican Council requesting this definition of the Apostolic See with great insistance.

"Subsequently these petitions and wishes not only did not diminish, but they increased from day to day in number and in insistence. Indeed, campaigns of prayer were promoted for this purpose; many and outstanding theologians intensified their studies on this subject, either in private, or in the public ecclesiastical universities and in other schools destined to the teaching of sacred discipline. In many parts of the Catholic world Marian Congresses were held, both national and international. All these studies and researches placed in clearer light that in the deposit of faith entrusted to the Church there was contained also the Assumption of the Virgin Mary into Heaven. There followed generally petitions in which this Holy See was urgently requested that this truth be solemnly defined.

"In this pious contest, the faithful were wonderfully united with their Pastors, who in really imposing number sent like petitions to this Chair of St. Peter. Wherefore, when we were elevated to the throne of the Sovereign Pontificate, there had already been presented to this Apostolic See many thousands of such supplications from every part of the earth, and from every class of persons: from our Beloved Sons and Cardinals of the Sacred College, from our Venerable Brother Archbishops and Bishops, from the Dioceses and from the Parishes.

"For this purpose, while we raised ardent prayers to God that he infuse in Our mind the light of the Holy Ghost to decide a cause of such importance, we gave special orders that more rigorous studies be taken up on this subject . . ."

A passage from the Roman Pontiff's allocution to the people on the occasion of the proclamation testifies that on the one hand he is deeply concerned with and keenly aware of the realities of the world, while on the other hand his single-eyed adherence to divine verities motivates a great and hopeful longing for the return of wandering sons to the one true Church:

> ". . . The world is without peace, tormented by mutual distrust, by divisions, litigations, by hatreds, for the reason that faith has been enfeebled in it, and the sense of love and fraternity in Christ has almost been extinguished. While we supplicate with all ardor that Mary Assumed into Heaven may mark a return of warmth of affection and life to human hearts, we do not tire of recalling to this world that nothing should ever prevail over the fact and the awareness that all men are sons of the same Mother, Mary, who lives in Heaven, the bond of union through the Mystical Body of Christ, as the new Eve, and the new mother of the living, who wishes to lead all men to the truth and the grace of her divine Son."

Responses From Various Parts

According to reflections in the press, the announcement of the proclamation made on August 14 aroused tremendous interest throughout the Christian world, Catholic as well as non-Catholic. From the Catholic side, it has been the occasion for reaffirming the Roman Pontiff's Infallibility, and the prerogatives of Mary, Mother of God, and Mother of men, and the strong affirmation that in our troubled and materialistic world, divine truths exist and can be known with certainty. From the non-Catholic side, the spirit of opposition prevails. The objections respond to a wide gamut of prevalent non-Catholic tenets. At one extreme are the rationalists rejecting the Virgin Birth, and not only the Assumption of Mary, but of all bodily resurrection. At the other extreme are Catholizing groups questioning who have difficulty in accepting the doctrine as of faith. The Anglican emphasis is rather upon the Pope's claim of infallibility as a teacher of revealed doctrine. Lutherans and Evangelicals have expressed their fears that Mary's glorification might confuse her with or substitute her for the Divinity, or lead to a usurpation of the Son as sole Mediator.

In these days when Christian reunion is a common preoccupation, the Holy Father's action in proclaiming this dogma has been received among non-Catholics with astonishingly grave concern. As a matter of fact, the proclamation has reference to the Catholic faithful whose spiritual welfare is the Holy Father's proper concern.Nevertheless, the Protestants for the major part examine this forward step of the Catholic Church in its relation to themselves. Since it either confirms a doctrine which they do not hold in common with us, or at least constitutes a use of papal infallibility which they are not prepared to accord us, they see in it a sign of withdrawal from the general move towards reunion.

On the positive side, the Catholics may take comfort in the desire for reunion which is reflected in their complaints, and beg Our Lady the more fervently to obtain that grace from her Son which is still wanting for the actual realization of that reunion in His divine charity and truth. We have made an affirmation of faith which is not in conformity with the projects of the "ecumenists". Is it not safer to place our hope rather in the Spirit of God, move docilely where He chooses to blow, and confide in Him to do the impossible,

than it is to trust in even the most enlightened plans which men have to offer for reunion? Heretofore men have shown themselves more adept in accomplishing division.

Statement of Anglican Archbishops of Canterbury and York from Lambeth Palace, Aug. 23.

"... We must at once state publicly that the Church of England does not and cannot hold this doctrine to be a necessary part of the Catholic faith, belief in which may be required of members of the Church.

"The Church of England renders honour and reverence to the Mother of Our Lord Jesus Christ. But there is not the smallest evidence in the Scriptures or in the teaching of the early Church of belief in the doctrine of her bodily assumption. The Church of England refuses to regard as requisite for a saving faith any doctrines or opinions which are not plainly contained in the Scriptures.

"We profoundly regret that the Roman Catholic Church has chosen by this act to increase dogmatic differences in Christendom and has thereby gravely injured the growth of understanding between Christians based on a common possession of the fundamental truths of the Gospel."

The statement contains no denial of Mary's bodily assumption into Heaven, but does affirm that Anglicans give fitting reverence and honour to Mary as Mother of Our Lord Jesus Christ. It would then assure us of a most heartening measure of belief in common as regards our beloved Mary. May the Mother of God increase their devotion to that fullness of belief enjoyed throughout their kingdom before the attacks waged against her sublime person at the time of the Reformation.

The Holy Father's intention in defining the Assumption is misconstrued when any choice is read into it to withdraw us further from our separated brethren. What motivated him was the pious will to bring us closer to our Heavenly Mother. The supposition that he has in some wise chosen to aggravate differences is quite groundless, but insistence upon the misconception is patently a likely tool for widening the breach. Yet the longing for union reflected in the statement is truly a Christian aspiration and should be fostered by an appreciative effort of good will from both sides. We hope it is not too much to ask of the Anglicans that they dwell more upon the positive side of the situation, and see that the Pope in clarifying and verifying a universal belief of the Catholic Church is withdrawing absolutely nothing from "the common possession of the fundamental truths of the Gospel."

Methodist Faith and Order Committee, Weekly Times, Aug. 23.
(In accord with the Anglican Statement)

"Dr. H. Watkin-Jones, convener of the Methodist Faith and Order Committee, stated on Thursday that Methodists generally will be in agreement with the Archbishops' statement, and added that though they recognized the right of the Roman Catholic Church to institute any beliefs to which it might be minded, Methodists would not include in their dogma anything which is not included in the Scriptures or for which there is not an absolutely clear Scriptural implication."

Weekly Times, August 23. (The rationalist view)

"Lack of confidence by Christian scholars in the statement of the Virgin birth as historical fact was expressed by Dr. C. J. Wright, a member of the tutorial staff at St. Augustine's College, Canterbury, one of the principal mis-

sionary colleges of the Church of England, when speaking at the Modern Churchmen's conference at Cambridge on Thursday.

"Dr. Wright read a paper urging reform of the dogmas and creeds of the Church, . . . A large body of thoughtful, moral, and spiritual people (he affirmed, did not find the two approved creeds, the Apostles' and the Nicene, an adequate expression of their Christian convictions. They were revered historical documents; once they were symbols of unity; but they had grown old and were now symbols of division within the Church . . . no teaching and missionary Church could perpetuate language that distorted and stultified the living truth or repudiated the results of disinterested reasearch."

Dr. Wright's rejection of the Creeds in view of modern thought and science (the world was always "modern", and has never failed to place errors and heresies against divine doctrine) would not only cut the divine message to the measure of man's intellect, but it would as well cut away the foundations of the confession to which he professes allegiance, since it obliges adhesion to the Creeds and the early traditions of the Church. Or can an Anglican reject the Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty-nine Articles and still be an Anglican?

Sermon of Fr. J. C. Heenan. (Why so much opposition?)

In a sermon delivered in Westminster Cathedral, Fr. J. C. Heenan, Superior of the Catholic Missionary Society, made a strong, clear response to the statement of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in which he established that there was no question of new doctrine, and certainly not of a 'new dogma'. In affirming that the Holy Father certainly had no intention of fostering disunion, he presented an enlightening opinion on the reasons for the opposition of these Anglican dignitaries:

"Let me say quite simply and quite frankly that I do not really believe that the Definition of the Dogma is the real reason why the Archbishops of the Anglican Church have seen fit to attack the authority of the Catholic Church. I think that the reason goes much deeper. The reason, in my view, is this. There could be scarcely a more obvious mark of the authority of the Catholic Church than that when this doctrine is defined nearly 400,000,000 people throughout the world will immediately and gladly give their obedience.

"This is the day when religious authority outside the Catholic Church is almost finished, and I believe that behind this criticism there is a deep envy."

He denied further the Anglican claim that the Church of England is based on Holy Scriptures, and in this context asked a question which incidentally bears upon the Anglican claim of Catholic continuity: "Where in the pages of Holy Scripture will you find the warrant for the royal supremacy? Was it not the Parliament which founded the Church of England, as it is Parliament to-day which has the last word on the doctrines of the Church of England! They cannot even have a prayer book unless Parliament agrees."

The Pilot, (Catholic) Boston, Sept. 2.

(Can the Archbishop of Canterbury speak for his flock?)

"No one was very surprised over the statement of the Anglican hierarchy on the announcement of the Holy Father's coming definition of the Assumption of Our Lady . . . They seemed to know what was and what was not a required teaching of their denomination.

"Amid this surety, imagine their consternation some days later in finding a dignitary of their own church announcing at a church conference that there

was no historical reason for believing in the Virgin Birth of the Saviour. Immediately, again, the Archbishop of Canterbury made a public pronouncement to the effect that his church 'holds and proclaims' this doctrine. This seemed to write finis to the controversy. But lo and behold, after a few days a whole group of Anglican clergymen challenged the Archbishop's declaration and denied that it was a 'fact of history' or a required teaching of the Anglican Church. Since then no word from the Archbishop.

"This interesting combination of incidents raises a very pertinent question. Who is to say just what belongs to the teachings of the Anglican Church? Can anyone say with finality that any Christian teachings, including the Assumption, is or is not a part of Anglican doctrine? When someone answers by saying that the Archbishop of Canterbury speaks for the church he finds himself face to face with a much more difficult question: By what authority does *he* speak? . . . (On authority of Anglican teaching, see "A Discourse of the Anglican Archbishop of York", p. 297).

The Tablet, Sept. 2, Letter of Paul Henderson.
(Assumption in English Tradition)

"Dear Sir.—The Archbishop of Canterbury objects to the dogma of the Assumption, but his predecessor at Canterbury, Archbishop Lanfranc, in his Calendar, made the Assumption one of the five principal feasts of the year, and the greatest feast of Our Lady. The Archbishop of York also objects, but it is proclaimed in his own Cathedral at York, in stone five hundred years old, in the centre boss over the entrance to the choir from the nave. Lingard's *Anglo-Saxon Church* records that the laws of King Alfred required that the feast of the Assumption should be kept as a public holiday, whereas it was not until the reign of Edgar that the three other feasts of Our Lady then observed were so honoured; and the evidence is manifold, both written and iconographical, of the devotion which this title of Our Lady inspired in England through much of the greater part of the period which separates us from the landing of St. Augustine . . . "

THE GUARDIAN (Anglican) Sept. 8.
(Anglican theologians should study this doctrine)

Dr. E. L. Mascall, an Anglican theologian of note, in an article on the Assumption gives no place to those who would reject the corporal assumption of Mary in Heaven as a Christian teaching, although he is not prepared to affirm that it should be an article of faith. He writes:

". . . I want to emphasize at this point that, so far from wishing to deny the corporal assumption of the Blessed Virgin, I do in fact believe it to be true. In one respect the doctrine seems to me to hold a unique, or almost unique, position among the beliefs of Catholic Christians . . . Such a belief, held practically unanimously from the eight century onwards, can hardly, I would suggest, be rejected as untrue by anyone who believes that the Church is under the guidance of the Holy Spirit. But neither, in view of the silence of the early centuries, can it be maintained to be part of that deposit of faith the rejection of which is manifest heresy. To accept the corporal assumption as true seems to me to be a matter of common sense and ordinary humility for anyone who is conscious of his solidarity with the whole Catholic Church of the ages; to deny it (for there is no positive evidence against it) seems to me to be an act of singular intellectual self-assertion; but to impose it as a dogma necessary for salvation is quite another matter. And I would suggest that Anglican theologians ought

seriously to consider the status of a doctrine which has acquired this kind of universal acceptance."

Dr. Mascall terminates with his idea of two regrettable effects of the definition: divergences between the Catholic Church and other Christian bodies would be increased, and those seeking to understand the place of Mary in the Christian dispensation would be repelled. He concludes: "At such a time there would seem to be a special duty resting upon Catholic-minded Anglicans to be unflagging in prayer and work for Catholic unity and in devotion to the Mother of God."

We applaud his conclusion. In this action of the Church where a fuller enlightenment of already existing doctrine was the end in view, separations will not be increased unless the difference is propagandized as such. On the other hand, we—and they as well — are called upon to hasten understanding and union through unflagging prayer and increased filial devotion to the Mother of God and men.

LE MONDE, Paris, October 26.

(Statement of French Protestants)

The general assembly of French Protestants has recently passed a motion which defines its position in reference to the Catholic Church.

They are encouraged by what they find to be current tendencies among Catholics: a renewed interest in the Bible and in the Ecumenical Movement, and a more objective attitude toward the Reformation, which they feel are conducive to mutual comprehension. On the other hand, they regret that the magisterium does not seem to encourage the irenic tendencies, and fear that it is withdrawing from evangelical truth on important points. They also state that "they remain ready and disposed to undertake fraternal conversations with Roman Catholics, with the understanding that the members of the *Reformed Churches* could not submit themselves to any other authority than that of the word of God. But in any event, the end of ecumenism could not be the victory of any Church whatsoever over another Church."

The assembly recommends as well to the Protestants that with regard to the Catholic Church they refrain from "all badly founded judgements and from any attitude of belittlement".

The Protestant assembly is evidently striving to make an objective statement of its position, and is borne up by courageous good will. It is the good will which would be a requisite for triumph in the severe trial of conscience which would be theirs if the enlightenment were given them to perceive that perhaps the Word of God has declared that He does speak through the authorities of His choice upon earth, and that the Word Whom they justly venerate speaks today through the Church He founded as really as when He walked in Galilee. In this a case a return to that Church would signify nothing of a triumph of one Church over another, but their own triumph in a full acceptance of His divine Will.

In the meantime, we reiterate their own cautions against badly founded judgments and efforts of belittlement in view of the fact that whatever any of us mortals possess of the divine is a gift, and stands as constant testimony to our heavenly Master's incredible humility.

TABLET, Sept. 2.

(A Catholic is troubled)

Robert Speaight, a Catholic layman and distinguished writer, in a letter to the Editor manifests a certain timidity and fear before hypothetical consequences of the proclamation. We cite a passage containing problems of particular interest:

"Your articles on the doctrine of the Assumption will be read with interest, though hardly with complete satisfaction, by those Catholics who, like myself, had hoped that the belief in the bodily assumption of Our Lady into Heaven would not be declared an article of faith. It is already clear that the prospect of this has disquieted the Protestant world, appearing yet another obstacle in the way of Christian reunion, and the statement by the Warden of Pusey House makes it clear that these misgivings are shared by those members of the Church of England who are nearest to us in doctrinal sympathy. I was surely not alone in asking myself whether the promulgation of the dogma was worth the alienation of a single soul from the Church. And now that the supreme authority has spoken, we are entitled, I think, to some very hard-headed explanations from our theologians. In what way can the doctrine of the Assumption be held to be implicit in the original *depositum fidei*—laid down while Our Lady was still alive?

"... here, it may be argued, the doctrine of Papal Infallibility enters in to remove our doubts. But while I am protected by my belief in infallibility, my Protestant neighbour is not..."

TABLET, Sept. 16

(Response to Robert Speaight)

The above letter aroused a number of responses which clarified the genuine Catholic position. A passage from an article entitled *To Whom Shall We Go?* responds adequately to the question on the possible estrangement of non-Catholics.

"... It is the question of a generous sentimentalist to ask 'whether the promulgation of the dogma was worth the alienation of a single soul from the Church'. Few arguments could more easily be reduced *ad absurdum;* none of the Oecumenical Councils could be justified by it; Nicaea alienated the Arians, Ephesus the Nestorians and Pelagians; Chalcedon the Monophysites. The very foundation of the Church meant the exclusion of those who were not prepared to accept the discipline of the Church; the very definition of any law distinguishes between those who accept it and those who do not; the very existence of a dogmatic theology means the alienation of those who reject it. There have always been disciples to complain, as there were in the Synagogue at Capharnum, 'This saying is hard, and who can hear it?' But the hardest saying followed, No man can come to Me unless it be given him by My Father'; and when it was said many of the disciples went away, alienated, 'and walked no more with Him.' Christ asked the twelve, and it was St. Peter who answered for them: 'Lord, to whom shall we go'?"

TABLET, Sept. 9

(*The doctrine is implicit in the* depositum fidei)

Those wishing an adequate treatment of the manner in which the doctrine of the Assumption is contained in the *depositum fidei* will do well to refer to the Roman Pontiff's Bull *Munificentissimus Deus.* We publish here a pointed

response to Mr. Speaight's query from a letter of Fr. Bernard Leeming, S. J. to the Editor of the *Tablet:*

"... not to avoid the most pertinent question put by Mr. Speaight, namely, 'In what way can the doctrine of the Assumption be held to be implicit in the *depositum fidei?* That is the point upon which we require expert guidance.' The answer is, as far as I can learn: The doctrine of the Assumption is revealed in the whole complex of truths told us in Scripture and Tradition about Our Lady. These truths, taken in their coherence with one another, in their convergence to one conclusion and in their fitness with the whole of God's plan of redemption, contain—confusedly and implicity, indeed, and yet formally, the truth of the Assumption.

"... As regards our non-Catholic brethren, I am convinced that the definition of the Assumption will do a real service to them in showing them very definitely and clearly what the Catholic Church is. If they do not like it, alas, we must ask their forbearance, but we cannot pretend that we are different from what we are. The issue raised, I repeat, is the issue of the norm of faith and of agreement with the living mind of the living Church."

TABLET, Sept. 9.

(The dogma in the contemporary world)

An editorial under the title *Ideology or Faith* points out that opposition to the Catholic position has declined markedly in England since the time when the dogma of the Immaculate Conception was proclaimed. The writer finds that today there are Catholic sympathizers who place confidence in the Catholic Church as a principle of political unity, and as something "enduring and stable in a fast-changing world, something intellectually coherent and intelligible in a time of growing intellectual chaos... If in this storm they will not take refuge on the Rock, at least they will shelter in its lee".

He finds that some of the special attention being paid to the dogma arises from the remains of nineteenth-century rationalism. There is often strong reaction against this, which results in a "thirsting afresh for the wells of divine revelation", as the Holy Father remarked in his recent Encyclical. More often, he continues, "the critical articles represent, by their very criticisms, a minimizing of the differences that separate their writers from the Catholic Church, when they do not like to feel separated. By the very accentuation of the divergence about the Assumption of Our Lady the quite false impression can be left that without it there would be few theological distinctions of importance between Catholics and other Christians."

Further on he brings out the significance of the proclamation as evidence that the Church's primary preoccupation is with spiritual things. A Marxist could hardly say that the Church is seeking to gain political allies at the expense of spiritual goods, that "the Church is in fact, as propaganda from the East European countries always maintains, less concerned with religion than with the support of those political systems with which Marxism is in conflict." He continues, "One of the characteristics of a time that has so far lost any sense of the supernatural is this difficulty in believing that what is recorded in the newspaper headlines is in real truth not the main concern of the Church; in believing that the priests and Bishops imprisoned in Eastern Europe are not only praying for their own release. The war-time Encyclicals of Pius XII were opportune in this respect, that on the Mystical Body appearing on the eve of the allied landings in Italy and that on biblical studies just after the Germans had occupied

Rome, when most people were thinking of much more terrestrial topics. So it is now also; and if there is discussion about whether or not the definition of the Assumption is opportune it may be replied that it is opportune precisely to remind men that the mind of the Church is directed not on the temporal but on the spiritual plane, not in the natural but in the supernatural order."

OSSERVATORE ROMANO, Aug. 19.
(Why the dogma is opportune)

Fr. Charles Balic, Rector of the *Pontificio Ateneo "Antonianum"*, Counselor of the *Unitas* Central Committee, writes:

"... After two world wars in one generation, in the face of a persecution of God and the Church, perhaps unequalled in history, with men turning their backs on Heaven towards materialism, forgetting their sonship of the common Father and their membership in the same family, losing their view of the eternal destinies, what better remedy is there than raising men from the material swamp to the majestic position which is the image of God, showing them Heaven where awaits the true mother who has preceded in body and bone, taken there by the angels?

"... we cannot forget that the proper mission of the Church is the mission of truth, which is the way, the guide and the light of life, so that God and through Him His Vicar on earth, in manifesting a truth, makes the most beautiful and useful gift to men who, for their part, travel more comforted along the toilsome paths of exile..."

He concludes with a vision of the spiritual benefits to be expected from the doctrine of the Assumption:

"The Assumption, which recalls to belief in the resurrection of the body and life everlasting, is a fundamental truth of such significance that it will be able not only to produce a profound intellectual renewal, but will also inaugurate a new era of faith and the great return of scattered peoples to the unity of the true Faith in the bosom of the Holy Catholic Church under the protecting mantle of the only mother."

PILOT, (Anglican—Organ of the Society for Promoting Catholic Unity)

"The *Osservatore Romano,* in announcing the Holy Father's intention of defining the dogma of the Assumption of Our Lady, secured a quick response from the Archbishops of Canterbury and York. Whatever the reason might be which called forth so early an affirmation that the 'Church of England does not, and cannot, hold this doctrine as a necessary part of the Catholic Faith', the fact remains that, until the definition is proclaimed on All Saints Day, it is somewhat premature to express an opinion. The definition can add nothing to the Catholic doctrine on the point, it may clear up a good deal of existing misconception.

"Whilst it is true that the Assumption of Our Lady has provided material for imaginative speculation, given the truths of the Immaculate Conception, the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection of Our Lord, it is difficult to escape the logic of the bodily assumption of Blessed Mary..."

PASTORAL LETTER of the German Hierarchy.
(The dogma has a salutary message)

A Pastoral Letter of the German Hierarchy signed by Archbishop Wenderlin of Freiburg, informs the faithful on the meaning and purpose of the defi-

nition of the corporal assumption of Mary into Heaven. In it is found the following passage on its singular timeliness:

"... we are convinced that the doctrine of the corporal assumption of Mary has a much more profound significance for the sorrowing humanity of our most sad times than appears at first sight. We believe that this doctrine has an intimate connection with the problems of our tormented epoch. It is the human problem which preoccupies the world now, the problem of reconstructing the personality which the world-wide catastrophe has destroyed. It seems to us that the question of the body and corporal death is bound up with this urgent problem. Certainly, our Christian faith gives exhaustive responses to such questions; but it seems essential and necessary that the responses obtained assume tangible and concrete form. Precisely this occurs in the figure of Mary: Mary is the human creature as God originally wished it, and as Christ wishes to reconstruct it through the redemption; Christ and Mary show us what 'the redemption of our body' will be of which St. Paul speaks in the Epistle to the Romans (8;23); and the concept of the corporal assumption of the Madonna in Heaven gives our thoughts the necessary Christian inclination..."

A statement of the "Orthodox" position.

The Russian professor Pierre Kovalevsky, General Secretary of the Inter-orthodox Committee for Ecumenical Action published a statement in *Le Monde* of Paris under date of October 19. He makes a personal effort to establish the position of the "Orthodox" Church with regard to the Assumption of the Blessed Virgin Mary. This statement is reprinted according to corrections published in *Le Monde* of October 26.

"1.) Belief in the Assumption of the Holy Virgin has been common to the whole Church since the most ancient times. If the date for the feast of the Assumption was not fixed definitely as the fifteenth of August until the reign of the Emperor Maurice (582), and if the chant proper to this feast dates only from St. John Damascene (VIIIth cent.), St. Cosmas of Jerusalem, and St. Theophane of Nicea (IXth cent.), they nevertheless carry on a tradition which was living in the East as well as the West from the first centuries.

"2.) According to the orthodox tradition, The Holy Virgin always desired that she be not talked about. St. John, who for fifteen years drew from the source of her who guarded in her heart all the words of the divine Son (Lk. II, 51), along with St. Mathew and St. Mark, tell very little of her life.

"St. Luke, who according to tradition, was very attached to the Holy Virgin, mentions only the Annunciation, and the Visitation, does not speak either of her Nativity or Presentation at the Temple, and does not mention the Assumption in the Acts.

"3.) A dogma is, according to the Orthodox Church, 'a revealed fact, formulated by the councils and accepted by the Church', which is not the case with regard to the Assumption of the Holy Virgin, since it is not based upon a revealed fact nor upon any Scriptural text.

"A dogma is formulated, according to the tradition of the Orthodox Church, at such time as a particular teaching of the Church is denied or placed in doubt, and hence requires definition.

"4.) The Christian East has always considered that formulas kill the spirit, and that human words are incapable of expressing the depths of a belief, and they limit them rather than giving them more profound expression."

According to Prof. Kovalevsky, the Oriental Church unlike the Western Church has not found it expedient to define doctrine for the purposes of better exposition of the faith or promotion of the faithful's devotion. Yet, if a particular doctrine is in fact to be found in the content of revelation what is there that would necessarily impede its declaration as such by the Church if an official affirmation should benefit the faithful?

The argument of this Russian member for the dissident Oriental Church would have weight only if the tradition of the early Church were to be accepted as incapable of development. Yet even he does not seem to embrace such a concept of a crystallized tradition since he does not hesitate to embrace a much more radical development when he says that a dogma is something which should be "accepted by the Church". This practice of "sobornost" is a development of modern times among the "Orthodox". The early Councils proclaimed doctrine and presented it to the faithful, not for their further deliberation or approval, but for their acceptance as conclusive teaching. Anathema was the response to those who continued to demur.

The objection that formulas kill the spirit appears to us to fall wide of the mark. It is suggested to no one that they be used as text for prayers or as a substitute for meditation. Definitions of the Church stand forever as invitations to consider the height and the depth of the divine verities they affirm. As for limitation, they limit only insofar as they exclude error. Admixture of error in matters concerning the Divinity is hardly conducive to a free and direct approach to God who is Himself Truth. On the contrary, those prayers and divine considerations which are channeled in conformity with doctrinal formulas should by virtue of them be confirmed, intensified, and speeded on their quest.

But of much vaster import than these differences of detail which can be blown aside in an instant by the breath of the Holy Ghost is the agreement between East and West that Mary, Mother of God and of men, indeed dwells gloriously in Heaven both in soul and in body as we may some day hope to do. May the love of a common Mother nurture an ever stronger affection between her children, and may her maternal love for her sons in grace inspire her to lead our separated brothers back to a joyous reunion with their family in Christ.

LE MONDE, October 31.
(In defense of the dogma)

Letter of M. Maleissye-Melun to the Editor:

"... the bishops of the entire world have had their attention drawn to the question since 1940, and theologians and scholars have not ceased since the Vatican Council discussing... the possibility and the opportuneness of the proclamation of the dogma.

"... When one has read the history of the polemics aroused in the midst of the higher French clergy at the approach of the proclamation of the pontifical infallibility, one wonders why it is that the controversies were so quiet this time. Were not the Catholic festivities of 1931, the fifteenth centenary of the Council of Ephesus and of the proclamation of the dogma of 'Mary, Mother of God' a kind of preparation and a prelude to the festivities of November 1, 1950? For indeed, devotion to the Virgin is not a modern thing. The anathema cast forever upon those who would not believe in the divine maternity dates from 431: were not all the dogmatic proclamations which have followed included in that one?

"Now if I should depart from the question of law and dogma to speak of religious tradition recognized and accepted by the Pontifical See, should I recall

that the most ancient testimony of belief in the Assumption in the West is found in a Gallican missal of the VIIth century, and that this feast was glorified by many doctors of the Church, of whom one is St. Bernard? Should I recall that the Assumption of the Most Holy Virgin is the fourth glorious mystery of the rosary, upon which meditations have been made at least since the XVth century? Should I recall the vow of Louis XIII in 1643: France consecrated to the Virgin Mary and the procession taking place on the feast of the Assumption? Should I recall that this feast has been declared by the concordat of 1802 a feast of obligation in France, and has remained so, as well as Belgium which also has a concordat?

"The dogma comes, therefore, to consecrate tradition."

THE TIMES (London), Oct. 13.

(Archbishop of York on Assumption and Authority)

The Archbishop of York, addressing Convocation of York today, dealt with the proposed Roman Catholic dogma of the Assumption.

He said that the Church of England has always honoured the Blessed Virgin as the Mother of Jesus; but it could not accept a dogma which had neither scriptural, historical, nor doctrinal foundation. Many Christians outside the Roman Church must regret the new doctrine because the claim of Christianity as a historical religion might be prejudiced if a pious belief with no historical support was treated as a fact of history in the same sense as the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.

Papal authority enabled a decisive judgment to be given on controversial matters; but that centralization was in contrast both to the example of Jesus and the practice of the early Church. The Orthodox Churches of today knew of no infallible authority which had the right to impose new dogmas.

The Church of England was sometimes said to lack authority in its teachings. But the faith was stated plainly in the three Catholic Creeds, in the Prayer-book, in its Ordinal and Catechism, and, in relation to the period in which they were drawn up, in the Thirty-nine Articles. Those doctrines were based upon, and tested by, the Scriptures and the interpretation given them by the early Fathers. The Church of England combined authority with freedom, giving its members the freedom to discuss its teachings and to examine their foundations. That course had risks, but the absolutism of the Roman Church brought far greater dangers to scriptural and apostolic doctrine.

The difference between the Church of Rome and the Church of England in authority in doctrine briefly was this: if a Pope speaking authoritatively made an erroneous doctrinal statement he would commit the whole of the Roman Church, and no one within it would dare to contradict or criticize. But if an Archbishop of Canterbury made an equally erroneous statement he would not commit the Church of England to it; he would be contradicted and argued with by theologians, overruled by the common consent of the clergy and laity, and, if need arose, repudiated by Convocation.

Dr. Garbett concluded: "I very much regret the Pope's intention to proclaim a new dogma; his recent Encyclical and various utterances by Roman Catholics have forced into controversy many who would have greatly preferred at this time to have remained silent. We admire the devotion of millions of members of the Roman Catholic Church, its greatness as a school for saints, its steadfastness in defence of a supernatural faith, and the loyalty of so many of its clergy and laity under Communist persecution. But the proposed dogma will add yet another obstacle to Christian unity. In opposition to Roman Catholic

claims, we must with charity but with firmness make it plain that the Church of England is the ancient Catholic Church of this land, and that it holds the Catholic Creeds, the Sacraments instituted by our Lord, and the threefold ministry; and that at the same time, as a reformed Church, it appeals to the Scriptures and to sound learning, and respects the spiritual freedom for its members."

OSSERVATORE ROMANO, Oct. 28

The *Osservatore Romano* replied to the above objections with an article of Fr. Boyer, President of the *Unitas Association:*

A DISCOURSE OF THE ANGLICAN ARCHBISHOP OF YORK

DURING THE MONTH of October, Dr. Garbett, Anglican Archbishop of York, whose see is, along with Canterbury, the highest authority of the Church of England (although subject to the supremacy of the Sovereign) expressed his opinions on the dogma of the Assumption of Mary which the Sovereign Pontiff defined on the first of November. His discourse was directed against the definition. As is to be supposed, a Catholic will find many observations to be made on the words of the high Anglican dignitary. Here I shall do no more than speak of one or another of them, not with a polemical intention, but rather with the idea of making clear the points of divergence so that reflections may be the better orientated. This is a means, as I see it, of preparing for a better understanding in the future.

In the first place I make the observation that Dr. Garbett's objections envisage not only the opportuneness of the definition, nor merely the fact of the definition, but actually bear upon the reality of the Assumption. Even so, there are groups of Anglicans who believe in this reality, and who celebrate the feast. These, at least, are no more disturbed than the Catholics by the absence of historical documentation on the last earthly days of the Virgin, and find that light coming from elsewhere suffices. Arguments are drawn from the incomparable dignity of the Mother of God, the miraculous preservation of her virginity, the fullness of her grace, her constant association in the mysteries of her Son, and the spontaneous judgment of the Christian mind: have they no value, and are they not on the contrary just as sound and conclusive as the words of a witness? They have been repeated for at least twelve or thirteen hundred years. In recent days they have been stated again in a great number of writings, and these of a perfectly scientific nature. Is it quite just not to take them into account?

Dr. Garbett declares that the papal power of making a definitive pronouncement in controversial matter is contrary to the example of Jesus and to the practice of the primitive Church. And yet, how often there resounds in the Gospel that solemn phrase: *But I say unto you!* . . . Was all power given to the Son, who proclaimed Himself our sole Master, so that He would leave men in all the doubts in which He had found them? Not only in our days, but in the distant days of Athanasius as well, Julius I, Bishop of Rome, (and Dr. Garbett knows that I could go still further back) wrote to the bishops of the East; "Do you not know that the usage is that one writes to us first, and that what is right is decided from here?"

Catholic theologians are of accord with Dr. Garbett that new dogmas are not to be admitted, if one means by this dogmas which are in no wise to be found in the revelation announced by the Apostles. But if they are found there implicitly, and if they are in following times drawn forth under the direction of the Holy Ghost, be it through the necessity of combatting heresy, or be it

through the utility of a better exposition of the faith, or again for the satisfaction of the faithful's piety, is there anything in all this which is not in conformity at once with the richness of revelation and the laws of the human spirit? But, the Catholic doctors explain how the truth of the Assumption of Mary is implicitly contained in what was originally taught us concerning the Mother of God.

It is true that if the knowledge of dogmatic truth is to develop rightly, an infallible authority is necessary. Dr. Garbett seems to admit the infallibility of the first Fathers. Why is it that this would since have been lost to the Church, to whom her divine Spouse promised His aid even until the consummation of the world? Is it not evident that the authority claimed by Dr. Garbett for the Church of England is insufficient? If an archbishop of Canterbury errs, he says, he will be corrected by the theologians, controlled by the common consent of the clergy and the laity, and should there be need, repudiated by Convocation. In the supposition that all takes place according to his optimistic predispositions, neither the clergy, nor the laity, nor the convocation, to my knowledge, are infallible. How then is one to know that the Archbishop of Canterbury really erred?

It would be a simpler thing to put one's faith in the Gospels, and to accept, along with the English saints Thomas More and John Fisher what was said to Peter: "whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven".

THE TABLET, October 21.
(A challenging question)

Dom Aelred Graham, O.S.B., of Ampleforth Abbey, composed an open letter to the Archbishop of York in response to his discourse. We are not attempting to reprint it here in whole or in part for the very reason that it is a remarkably masterful article. Space does not permit reprinting it in entirety, and it would be unworthy of this fine article to suppress any of its parts. However, we point out that his solidly based and well documented arguments lead up to a challenging query for the Anglicans: "Is there in this world a living voice qualified to state, on Christ's authority, what is contained in God's saving revelation? Or is there not?"

We recommend to our readers that they consult *The Tablet* for the integral text, and think that they would do well to go further and study the commendable series of articles and letters which have appeared in that publication on the Assumption since the middle of August when the dogma was first announced.

THE CATHOLIC TIMES, (London) Nov. 8.
(The Assumption and Reunion)

"... The dread that the defining of the dogma of the Assumption will add to the difficulties of reunion between Catholics and Protestants exists only in Protestant minds. For all along Catholics have maintained that reunion must be based on unity of belief, not on compromise. There can be only one true Church; that Church is built on the rock of Peter which is the papacy. A prime factor of belief is the supremacy and infallibility of the Pope. When papal infallibility is accepted, there can be no difficulty about the Assumption, the Immaculate Conception or any other dogma that may be defined... It may well be that the definition of the Assumption would help the cause of 'reunion' by making clear the terms on which 'reunion' must come about."

COMMENTS FROM LUTHERANS AND EVANGELICALS.

Lutherans and Evangelicals have reacted with many pronouncements according to their lights upon this proclamation which they have received as a matter of extreme gravity. Since their objections follow the lines of their traditional stand with regard to the Catholic Church and the cult of the Blessed Virgin Mary, their arguments are basically similar. We have selected typical comments.

Pastoral Letter of Bishop May, Evangelical Church of Austria.

"... In this we are of one mind: we must give one true Evangelical and Protestant answer (to the 'new' Marian dogma). In it the two meanings of the term 'Protestant' should stand forth; namely opposition and witness. Coupled with the unequivocal Protestant NO there must be the pro-testari, that is, witness *for* the Evangelical faith. Likewise there must be emphasized the recognition of the Biblical truth of salvation attained solely through Christ, through grace alone without the works or the cooperation of men, solely in Faith given and received.

"We do not wish to allow this occasion—unsought for by us—to pass without utilizing it for an explanation to the members of our community and to all those who wish to hear it, which will manifest the plain, simple Evangelical truth of the Gospel and of the evangelical faith. If this is our purpose, then we shall be decided and clarified before the many temptations, and shall be on our guard against them:

"1) against a cheap, rationalistic critique which all too easily militates against the Biblical faith;

"2) against indulging in hatred or petty polemics against Rome, and we shall not speak of superstition, nor ridicule the miracles of Lourdes, Fatima, etc., and other such;

"3) we shall refrain from all 'propaganda' against Rome or in our own favor."

Pastor Pierre Maury, President of the National Council of the Reformed Church of France, writing in *Réforme*, (Paris, Sept. 2) expresses "the first reactions of a Protestant" to the announcement of the imminent proclamation. He says that "even to the most superficial observer it will appear highly significant that the first verity imposed *ex cathedra* upon the belief of the faithful, since the Pope centered upon his person the right of the Church to speak without error, concerns not God, Christ, the Holy Ghost, or some ethical verity, but indeed Mary. It would appear that development of doctrine is to terminate in the placing of the Mother of the Savior in an eminent position hitherto insufficiently radiant, and not Him who was the Savior of all, including His mother... not only Roman piety, but also Roman faith are orientated upon an object and an intercession other than that of the one and sufficient Mediator." After having remarked that no historical document confirms the doctrine, he asks "What was then the 15th of August for a Catholic if up until 1950 he had the doctrinal liberty of not believing in the Assumption?"

In the same edition of *Réforme*, Pastor Etienne Meyer remarks that "Rome still feels herself strong enough to impose upon her faithful the dogma of the Assumption, right in the midst of a period of ecumenical promulgation". He observes that the Catholic position demands an ecumenism which signifies a return of schismatics to the Roman Church. He says that Lutherans will main-

tain the attitude of Reformers, and expresses regret that, in his opinion, Rome has three times marked a retreat along the way of "ecumenism" (Instruction of the Holy Office on the "Ecumenical Movement", summer intention for Apostolate of Prayer, entitled "conversion of Protestants in the Missions," and proclamation of Dogma of the Assumption).

At Rome and elsewhere in Italy celebrations emphasizing the preeminence of Christ in Christian belief were organized by the Waldensians in protest to the dogma of the Assumption. An article written by Giovanni Miegge in *Luce*, a Waldensian periodical published at Rome, remarks, "If God had willed it, certainly He would have been able to resurrect Mary and attribute to her the honours which Catholic piety attributes to her". The author examines the history of the doctrine and concludes, "Neither Sacred Scripture nor the most ancient tradition, up to the VIth century contain the least evidence of the Assumption of the Virgin." The author explains the final proclamation as a triumph of popular piety.

(Dr. Piero Chiminelli, Vice-President of the *Unitas Association*, writing in the Sunday *Osservatore Romano* makes an observation on the Waldensian protest. He finds that the rich merchant Pietro Valdo, founder of the Waldensian sect, had chosen precisely the feast of the Assumption, 1173, to distribute his goods to the poor.)

Five professors of the Evangelical faculty of Heidelberg, headed by Prof. E. Schlink, acting as members of an ecumenical group, have drawn up their objections to the corporal Assumption of Mary. The document has been presented to a group of Catholic theologians. It has been published by the Christian Kaiser Verlag, Munich.

In the first part it is found that neither Scripture nor tradition of the first five centuries report the bodily Assumption of Mary. This silence of early tradition, according to the authors, is a proof that the doctrine was not transmitted. They reject the effort of "replacing the account of ocular witnesses... by theological deductions." They conclude that a Church which makes a dogma of the Assumption acts without apostolic sanction, hence without divine authority, and establishes by its own authority what men must believe to be saved.

The second part of the document deals with logical consequences of the doctrine upon fundamental teachings of dogmatic theology. In studying the Church's doctrine of "the earthly mother of the eternal Son of God", the document finds that Mary was a woman troubled in faith. The proclamation is seen as a step toward an affirmation that Mary is queen and sovereign, and even mediatrix and co-redemptrix. It is feared that in spite of the theologians' distinctions, the people will go too far, depart from belief in Christ as sole Redeemer, and run the risk of departing from faith in Christ. The Church is also seen as opposing the common efforts of Christian reunion. Since the Evangelical Church cannot defend this dogma, a common witness before anti-Christians and non-Christians is menaced. Ecumenical efforts of reunion are regarded as menaced by a supposed relative character given to truth. Particular confessions run the risk of confiding in their own justice.

Moreover, the authors are convinced that God wishes to show the way through the perils of these days of Christian oppression to all the Churches of the "oikumene". This way would be the way which love takes in its search for unity in truth for which Our Lord prayed.

The assembly of Bishops of the United Lutheran Church of Germany pub-

lished a letter of Bishop Meiser, director of the assembly, and Bishop of Bavaria, which contains the following:

"For the first time in history Christians hear a Pope who, basing himself upon his infallibility decreed in 1870, defines an article of faith. The opposition aroused in all the Christian churches by the proclamation of the dogma of papal infallibility, and which has caused the formation of the Old Catholic Church, receives today, in the moment when belief in the Assumption is erected as a dogma, an alarming and impressive justification. Indeed, this dogma is not only, as other ancient dogmas of the Roman Church, an erroneous interpretation of apostolic doctrine, it is without any scriptural foundation and signifies that the Bishop of Rome deliberately departs from faithfulness to the Apostles of Our Lord Jesus Christ."

The General Synod of the Netherlands Reformed Church had the following declaration read from the pulpit:

"The Roman Church venerates in Mary a human creature, who through virtue and grace collaborated in the work of God. In Mary the Catholic Church contemplates the degree of sanctity and glory which a human being may attain when sustained by grace.

"In according this attention to man in his collaboration, the Roman Church proceeds along a path which leads her farther and farther from the veneration of the sole grace of God. Alongside the gratitude due to Christ the Redeemer, is instituted gratitude toward Mary, cooperating in the work of her Son..."

CONCLUSION

The criticisms which have been made by the Protestant world,—and in which the Anglicans have participated to some extent—may be reduced to the three following complaints: to glorify Mary is to diminish Christ; Scripture says nothing about the Assumption; the definition is contrary to the ecumenical spirit.

These complaints are without foundation:

1. To glorify Mary is to glorify Christ in the same way as honouring a king's mother means giving honour to the king himself. From whence comes the grandeur of Mary if not from her motherhood of Christ? To exalt Mary is to exalt the power of the Heart of Christ Who could not fail to give Himself a mother worthy of Himself, nor to be a good son to her. Why the Immaculate Conception? Because of the Son of God's sanctity. Why the Assumption? Because of the impossibility of thinking that the body from which the glorious body of Christ was taken, and which remained virgin at the birth of Christ, would have been abandoned to the worms of the tomb by Mary's all-powerful Son. Why pray to Mary? So as to receive the grace of Christ. Indeed, it is Christ who saved us, but to save us with more tender kindness, and with greater efficacy He gave us His mother. Recourse to Mary does not cause Catholics to neglect recourse to Jesus Christ. For example, has not the veneration of the Blessed Virgin of Lourdes led to the most magnificent glorifications of Christ in His Sacrament?

2. Sacred Scripture gives no account of the Assumption of the Virgin, yet Catholics since the fourth and fifth century have taken from Scripture the idea of Mary which makes them certain of her Assumption. The Holy Ghost watches over the Church. The Christian mind has not judged without His light or His inspiration. Mary is the new Eve, exempt from the original condemnation of death, as well as of sin and the pains of child-birth. She could

very well, in imitation of her Son, descend into the tomb, but like her Son, she had to be resurrected without waiting for the general resurrection.

3. The ecumenism of the non-Catholics cannot hinder the Catholic Church from living her own proper life. The Pope did not promulgate the definition of the Assumption to estrange the Protestants, but to express and to confirm the faith of the Catholics. If the "Ecumenical Movement" excludes the possibility of an understanding without compromise with the Catholic Church, it renounces its original intention which was the reunion of all Christians. But the conditions of an understanding with Rome are not modified by the new definition. With it or without it, the principal obstacle remains the supremacy of the Roman Pontiff. If one comes to the point of admitting this, he also admits all the definitions which the Popes have made. If not, then the separation will persist. Could one not say, on the contrary, that the attitude assumed in such a great number of Protestant writings has been hardly "ecumenical"? Would it not have been possible, at least in the directing organs, to have made a more generous effort to understand the definition's true significance, and the reasons there were for making it? Since the Catholics have made adequate declaration of what their veneration of the Virgin in general consists in, and why they believe in the Assumption, accusations that they pronounced against Christ and His Gospel could have been avoided.

NEWS

Ecumenism and Reunion

Catholic Leaders in Unionistic Field Meet at Grottaferrata

A series of conferences on the problems of Christian reunion took place at the Abbey of St. Nilo at Grottaferrata, near Rome on September 20, 21, and 22. This gathering was sponsored by the Unitas Association, and was presided over by Fr. Charles Boyer, S.J. It was international in character, with representatives from France, Italy, United States, England, Belgium, Spain and Holland.

Various participants read papers and general discussions followed. Great profit was found in the mutual exchange and comparison of experiences, studies and views. Msgr. Dumont, O.P., director of the *Istina* Center of Paris, spoke on his institution of Oriental studies and its relations with the Russian *émigrés* at Paris; Bishop Calavassy who was a guest at the monastery at the time, contributed a talk on his Catholic group of Greek rite at Athens; Dom Bede Winslow, O.S.B., spoke of the activity in England which is centered about the *Eastern Church Quarterly;* Dom Columba Cary-Elwes, O.S.B. dealt with the relations between Catholics and Anglicans in England; Rev. Chavaz made a report on relations with Protestants in Switzerland; Dom Victor Warnach, O.S.B., of Maria Laach, gave a report on Germany; Fr. Garcia Van den Berk, A.A., described the Apostolate of Reunion in Holland; Fr. Courtney Murray, S.J., made a survey of the unionistic situation in the United States; Fr. Santiago Morillo, S.J. spoke of the extensive recent developments in Spain; Fr. Boyer made observations upon the "Ecumenical Council" before and after Amsterdam.

As was pointed out by the host, Abbot Isidor Croce, the Abbey of St. Nilo was an ideal location for such a reunion. This monastery of Byzantine rite, founded by the Basilian Monk St. Nilo in 1004, has been a point of contact between East and West for nine Centuries. Cardinal Bessarion, the celebrated protagonist of reunion of the fifteenth century was a commendatory Abbot.

The other members of the Conferences were Rev. Louis Bouyer, (Institut Catholique, Paris); Fr. Yves Congar, O.P.; Frs. David Lathoud, A.A. and Salvator Butler, S.A., (Secretaries of Unitas); Fr. Renato Pasini, O.C.D. (Promotor of Unitas groups, Italy); Fr. J. Hamer, O.P. (Belgium); Dom O. Rousseau, O.S.B. (editor of Irenikon, Chevetogne); Fr. Maurice Villain, S.M. (Lyons); Fr. Michel, O.F.M. Cap (Belgium); Dom Clement Lialine, O.S.B., (Chevetogne); Fr. R. Rouquette, S.J., (an editor of *Etudes*, Paris); Fr. Emile Herman, S.J., (Rector, Pontifical Oriental Institute, Rome); Fr. Bede MacEachen, S.A., European Chairman, Chair of Unity Octave; and Fr. Carlo Balic, O.F.M., Rector, Pontifical Ateneo "Antonianum", Rome.

On the third day the Holy Father graciously received the group in special audience, and having bestowed his blessing, permitted a photograph to be taken surrounded by these leaders in the work of Christian reunion.

During the year 1951 *Unitas* will print selections from the papers read at the conferences.

Two Significant Publications

We have received two significant publications of the World Council of Churches which will be commented upon in later editions of *Unitas*. The first of these is a pamphlet entitled, *The Church, the Churches and the World Council of Churches. The Ecclesiological Significance of the World Council of Churches.* It bears the explanation: "This statement was received by the Central Committee of the World Council of Churches and commended for study and comment in the Churches." It contains principally a clear statement of what the World Council is and is not.

The second of these publications is a booklet entitled, *The Church in the Purpose of God.* The cover declares it to be "An introduction to the work of the Commission of Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches in preparation for the third World Conference on Faith and Order to be held at Lund, Sweden, in 1952, by Oliver S. Tomkins, Secretary of the Commission.

Week of Prayer for the Unity of Christendom

We have also received a text of an invitation to prayer published by Dr. Oliver Tomkins, Secretary to the Commission of Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches for the *Annual Week of Prayer for the Unity of Christendom* which is observed at the same time as the Catholic Chair of Unity Octave. The intentions listed give evidence of an awareness of the problems which confront the non-Catholics who are striving to advance along the way of unity. The text reads as follows:

"Once more we join the Christians of many confessions to invite you, as you pray for the unity of the Church of Christ according to His will, to pray also for the work of 'Faith and Order'. From other sources, we hope, you will be receiving suggestions on prayer for unity during this Week, since its observance is slowly but surely gaining ground in many countries. Either in your personal prayers or as you lead corporate prayer, will you remember some of the following concerns which occupy our minds in 'Faith and Order' as we prepare for the conference to be held, God willing, at Lund in 1952.

The Nature of the Church: let us pray for ever deepening understanding of the nature of the Church in the purpose of God; for all biblical scholars and theologians whose work is revealing unexpected new sympathies and areas of agreement as they seek to get behind the misunderstandings created in recent centuries; for all whose faithful witness to the truth as they have received it enlarges the understanding of those from other traditions; for patience and faith to overcome apparently impenetrable barriers to agreement, sustained by the belief that, since our Lord wills unity, He can bring us to it.

"*Ways of Worship*: let us pray for those in all churches who are discovering afresh the riches inherent in the great tradition of Christian worship, especially the ever-fresh meaning of that Sacrament which our Lord instituted at His Last Supper;

"for all ways in which the common inheritance of worshipping Christians may lead to the reconciliation of differences which have grown up between us;

"for such a sharing of experience in prayer and worship that the inner meaning of our beliefs may become plain to those who have grown up in another tradition;

"for such a deepened understanding of the Spirit and the truth that we may be drawn closer to the Father who would have us to worship Him.

"*Intercommunion*: *let us pray* for a more widespread and urgent awareness of our separation from one another at the Lord's Table;
"for a better appreciation of the convictions held in this matter by those with whom we disagree and the ability to believe in each other's integrity;
"for all those, especially young men and women and members in the Younger Churches, who find our divisions to be incomprehensible, and so our barriers to communion to be quite intolerable;
"for the removal of all hindrances to a true communion with one another, in truth and love, in the Sacrament of Unity.
"*Other Matters*: *let us pray* for an honest understanding and admission of those various political, economic, social and other factors which helped to cause or perpetuate our divisions;
"for ability to recognize and accept the pressure of similar factors in our own time which, by God's grace, may lead us to unity if we have no real theological reasons for continued separation;
"for all who are engaged in actual schemes or negotiations for unity, that they may be led into unity in the truth and that their zeal may be an encouragement to others;
"for God's blessing upon the meeting of the Faith and Order Commission (August 14-18, 1951) which will have to complete plans for the Conference at Lund to which the churches have been invited to send delegates."

Decision of the Greek Church on the Ecumenical Council

An announcement has been received at Geneva from Prof. Alivisatos that the Holy Synod of the "Orthodox Church of Greece" has confirmed its original decision to collaborate fully in the work of the Ecumenical Council of the Churches. In the future representatives of the Church of Greece (dissident), both priests and laymen, will participate in the conferences and other activities organized by the Ecumenical Council and its different departments. (EPS)

Pastoral Letter of Netherlands Reformed Synod

In the month of June a commission of the General Synod of the Netherlands Reformed Church published a pastoral letter which defines the Reformed point of view with regard to the Catholic Church.

The Press Service of the Netherlands Reformed Church reports that such a statement has long been necessary. According to the writer, there had been fruitful collaboration betwen the two confessions during the war, when they raised a common voice against the tactics of the authorities of the occupation, in pastoral letters, and in material assistance to the population during the winter of famine. After the war, it is said, the Catholic Church returned to its former attitude of isolation. In these recent years groups have been formed here and there where Protestants and Catholics may carry on conversations, but this is only a matter of private effort.

The Press Service reports that the pastoral letter deals especially with the question of the veneration of the Blessed Virgin, the Mass, the Pope, and the Roman Church's manifestations of power.

The commission which drew up the letter sought to avoid any caricaturing of the Catholic Church, and strove to give it full justice. Where popular piety is mentioned, the commission adhered to the official doctrine of the Church as it is expressed in the decisions of the Councils and the Papal encyclicals. Biblical sources are used in responding to the texts.

The question of the Blessed Virgin treated at length, since the Protestants find that the cult of Mary is taking an increasingly large place in the Catholic Church. They fear that it is becoming a Church of Mary. They wish to know in what the cult of the Virgin consists.

The Commission addresses the pastoral letter to all the members of their confession. To insure a language which would be comprehensible by all, a layman was attached to the commission whose duty it was to prevent the usage of unintelligible theological terminology. Hence, it is hoped that Protestant laymen will be able to discuss their doctrine intelligently with members of other confessions.

Dr. von Thadden Attends Katholikentag

Dr. Reinhold von Thadden, President of the Assembly of German Protestants assisted upon invitation at the *Katholikentag* gathering held at Passau in early September. Thus he returned the visit of the Catholic representative to the Protestant assembly at Essen. In his address he said that the Essen assembly had enabled him to present a triple request to the *Katholikentag* assembly: The Protestant laymen ask the Catholics to believe that they ardently desire to obey God, that they love their own church in which they serve Jesus Christ, the sole Lord, and that they wish that Catholics and Evangelicals be not separated. (EPS)

* * * *

AROUND THE WORLD

ROME

Proclamation of the Dogma of the Corporal Assumption of Mary into Heaven

On October 31, Pope Pius XII in semi-private Consistory received the formal approbation of thirty-five Cardinals and 485 Patriarchs, Archbishops and Bishops present to his intention of proclaiming the definition of the corporal assumption of the Virgin Mary into Heaven. On November 1 he made the solemn proclamation from a throne erected before the facade of the Basilica of St. Peter (See *Comments and Documents* for text of definition). He was surrounded by about six hundred Patriarchs, Metropolitans, Archbishops and Bishops. It is calculated that some seven hundred thousand faithful assisted at this function. The Solemn Proclamation was followed by a Mass celebrated in honour of the Assumption (collect of the day *sub unica conclusione)* by the Holy Father in the Basilica.

Concelebration in Byzantine Rite at Papal Chapel

On November 26, His Holiness Pius XII, in Papal Chapel, presided at a pontifical Divine Liturgy in Byzantine rite. The Liturgy was celebrated by His Excellence Maximus IV Saigh, Patriarch of Antioch of the Melchites, with the concelebration of Their Excellencies Chami, Metropolitan Archbishop of Bosra; Nabaa, Metropolitan Archbishop of Beyrouth; Assaf, Archbishop of Petra and Philadelphia; Cattan, Titular Archbishop of Proconneso; Evreinoff, Titular Archbishop of Pario; Mele, Bishop of Lungro; Maalouf, Bishop of Baalbek; Hakim, Bishop of St. John d'Acre; Khoury, Bishop of Sidon; Calavassy, Titular Bishop of Theodoropolis, Exarch for the Catholics of Byzantine rite of Greece; Varouchas, Titular Bishop of Gratianopolis, Exarch for Catholics of

Byzantine rite of Turkey; Bucko, Titular Bishop of Cadi, Exarch for the Ruthenian Catholics of Western Europe; Bucys, Titular Bishop of Olympus; Perniciaro, Titular Bishop of Arbano; Meletijew, Titular Bishop of Heracleopolis, and the Most Reverend Archmandrites Isidore Croce, Abbot of St. Nilo of Grottaferrata, Haluszcznskys, Saba, Chaer, and Tautu.

The chant was executed by a Schola Cantorum composed of members from the Greek, Ruthenian, Armenian, Russicum Colleges, the Institute of St. John Damascene, and the Abbey of St. Nilo, under the direction of Fr. Nicholas Marangos of the Greek College of St. Athanasius.

A solemn celebration of the Divine Liturgy in Byzantine rite is at all times suavely impressive. The presence of the Papal Chapel and the attendant dignitaries bestowed great circumstance upon this pontifical concelebration of the Holy Sacrifice performed beneath the vast dome of St. Peter's Basilica. The rich variety of the vestments heightened its magnificence, and the throngs of faithful assisting in the tremendous vaulted nave and transepts added a note of immensity. It was a vision of Christ's living Mystical Body which can never be erased from the memories of those who had the privilege of participating in it. Moreover, this offering of the Lamb of God at the hands of these many prelates from the East on the Altar of Peter and under the presidency of his reigning successor was a brilliant manifestation of the Church's indestructible unity.

Pilgrimages of Catholic and Dissident Orientals

A group of 200 Armenian pilgrims visited Rome in the month of September. They had been invited by His Eminence Cardinal Agagianian, Patriarch of Cilicia of the Armenians, who lead the pilgrimage on the Jubilary visits to the Major Basilicas. They were accompanied by eight Archbishops and Bishops.

A group of 150 Ukrainian refugees from various parts of western Europe made a pilgrimage to Rome in September. Some separated Orientals were among them. The pilgrimage was directed by Bishop John Bucko, Apostolic Visitor of Catholic Ukrainians in Western Europe.

The "Unitas Foyer" for non-Catholics gave receptions of welcome to two pilgrimages in the month of October. One was a group of 60 Rumanians in exile, the majority of whom were "Orthodox" from Germany. The pilgrimage was led by Fr. Octavian Barlea, head of the Vatican Relief Mission for Rumanians. This was the second Rumanian pilgrimage of the Holy Year. One of the pilgrims, Prof. Racoveanu, formerly editor of an "Orthodox" theological review in Rumania, is at the present time occupied with the founding of a Rumanian cultural review in collaboration with several Catholic ecclesiastics. This review is designed to favor the cause of reunion. It will be entitled "Indreptar" (Way-Shower). Prof. Racoveanu is typical of many Rumanians who have begun to look upon the Roman Church with a different attitude since the persecution of Oriental Catholics in Rumania, and the compliance of the "Orthodox" hierarchy to the desires of Moscow.

The second reception was held for a group made up entirely of separated Russians from Paris. The pilgrimage of 25 persons was organized and headed by Fr. Rouet de Journel, S. J., Professor of the Institut Catholique, and librarian of the Slavic Library of Paris. The traditional Russian melodies sung by the "Russicum" choir at the reception were greatly appreciated.

A New Agreement Between Vatican and Portugal on Church in India

The Holy See and the Portuguese government have made an agreement modifying the Concordat of 1886 and the protocol of 1928 which granted the Portuguese government some voice in regard to the filling of Sees in Indian territory once under Portuguese influence. The text states that both the Holy See and Portugal recognize the propriety of adapting the stipulations of their Concordat "to the new situation in India".

Principal features of the existing Concordat were agreements by the Holy See (1) to allow the President of Portugal to present names for the Vatican's consideration for filling vacant Sees, (2) to consult with the Portuguese government about candidates of its own which it wished to name to certain Sees, and (3) to name a Portuguese in alternate succession to a British national as the Ordinary of the Bombay archdiocese.

The present agreement states that the Portuguese government renounces the privilege of presenting names for the Indian Sees of Mangalore, Quilon, Trichinopoly, Cochin, Mylapore and Bombay. The Portuguese government considers the Holy See free from the promise to consult the President and to name Portuguese nationals to the Sees of Cochin and Mylapore. The Holy See is also released from its promise to name alternately a Portuguese and British national as the Ordinary of Bombay.

It is made clear in this connection that according to the earlier agreements the Holy See had consented to treat with the Portuguese government but had reserved to itself the actual naming of Bishops. (NC)

* * * *

ENGLAND

Hierarchy Centenary Congress

The Catholic Church in England commemorated the restoration of its Hierarchy with a Centenary Congress which lasted through a week of tremendous celebration in the last part of September. The restoration had been effected with the Apostolic Letter *Universalis Ecclesiae,* dated September 29, 1850. His Eminence Cardinal Griffin presided over the Congress as Papal Legate. Sixty-five archbishops and bishops, seven of whom are cardinals assisted at the celebration. Six of the cardinals, twelve archbishops and forty-six bishops had come from abroad to give homage along with the Apostolic Delegate and the Hierarchy of England and Wales.

The celebrations, testifying to the virile faith of the renewed Church in England, was an even greater triumph than had been anticipated. At Wembley Stadium a crowd estimated at 90,000 faithful assisted at the colossal pageant representing the History of the Church in England, and at the Pontifical Mass which followed it. This impressive Congress has left behind it a firmly established conviction that the Catholic Church in England has proceeded far in these last hundred years toward regaining its proper place in the life of the Church Universal. We are calling upon the words of the Roman Pontiff to convey the significance of this glorious event. We wish at the same time to draw attention to the Holy Father's constant and deeply felt concern for return to unity which is expressed in it.

Letter of Pope Pius XII Appointing His Eminence Cardinal Griffin Legate to the English Hierarchy's Centenary Congress

"Pius XII, Pope to our beloved son Bernard Griffin, Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church of the title of St. Andrew and St. Gregory on the Coelian Hill, and Archbishop of Westminster.

"Beloved son, greetings, and our Apostolic Benediction.

"A hundred years have rolled by since our predecessor of undying memory, Pius IX, issued the apostolic letter which happily restored to England and Wales the Catholic Hierarchy so long denied them.

"A grateful task is yours, to celebrate this memory as it deserves: and we too are fain to look back over the consequences of that step, and remember how good they have been, how encouraging, how useful.

"We mean the increased estimation in which Catholicism is held; the many churches that have been newly built, or restored to their ancient glory; the schools and colleges you have opened on all sides, attended by an ever-growing number of pupils; the advance of your clergy in number and in holiness; and finally the great army of faithful people that continually gains strength and is bound to its pastors by closer ties of loyalty.

"All this is a notable proof that Cardinal John Henry Newman, that shining light, that pride of your race, was happily inspired when he described the age which was to see the Catholic Hierarchy restored as a Second Spring.

"The rapid progress you and your fathers have made during this past century should be the omen, under God's assistance, of still greater heights of achievement.

"It is for you, who can rightly boast that membership of Holy Church makes you valuable servants of the Commonwealth, to show others, all the more clearly, the light of Christian holiness. Above all, you must besiege the Eternal Godhead with humble prayers that the Catholic Church may make daily greater advance among you.

"Your country was once called and with good reason, an island that nurtured Saints. From the earliest times, it has produced many noble champions who upheld the claims of Catholic doctrine, Catholic unity; may their example inspire you!

"And there are those among your fellow countrymen who already, in the blessed abodes of heaven, enjoy the reward of their labours; may they, at this auspicious moment, come to your side as none else can, by asking God in your name for His Heavenly assistance.

"To the whole English race our heart goes out in fatherly affection, and it is with the utmost confidence that we repeat the divine prayer of Jesus Christ himself: 'Holy Father, keep them true to Thy Name. Thy gift to Me, that they may be one, as We are One. . . Keep them holy through the truth. . . It is not only for them that I pray, I pray for those who are to find faith in Me through their word, that they may all be one.' (John 17, 11; 17, 20, 21).

"Meanwhile, for the greater honouring of this centenary, we appoint you, beloved son, our legate *a latere*, and give you commission to preside in our name at all public gatherings and sacred ceremonies, and enhance the splendour of them with the dignity of the Roman purple.

"And so, to be the earnest of Heavenly graces and the testimony of your good will, we impart to you, beloved son, to the other bishops of England

and Wales, to the clergy, and to the faithful who are committed to your charge, most affectionately in the Lord's Name, our Apostolic Benediction.

"Given at Rome, at St. Peter's, this sixteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord, 1950, the twelfth of our pontificate. Pius XII."

* * * *

UNITED STATES

New Institute of Contemporary Russian Studies

The Institute of Contemporary Russian Studies was opened in September with an inauguration ceremony at which His Eminence Cardinal Tisserant, Secretary of the Sacred Congregation of the Oriental Church presided.

This Institute, established by Fordham University of New York, presents a program in the language, history, geography, literature, philosophy and political theory of Russia. It will be open to men and women on the adult education level, as well as to college students.

Prof. Richard T. Burgi, assistant professor of Russian language and literature at Yale University, is acting as visiting director of the institute. The Rev. Andrei Ourousoff, Russian Jesuit on the University faculty, conducts two courses in the history of Russian religious thought and the contemporary religious situation of the U.S.S.R. Profs. Oscar Halecki and Nicholas Timasheff of the graduate schools, teach Russian history and communist society, respectively.

Literature courses are taught by Sergei Maksimov, Mikhail Koriakov and Helene Iswolsky, all Russian authors. The Russian language studies are taught by Prof. Burgi and native Russians; Prof. Robert C. Pollock conducts a course on the political and social philosophies of Hegel, Marx and Lenin, while area studies are supervised by the Rev. J. Franklin Ewing, S.J., known for his anthropological work in the Far East. Certificates of proficiency will be awarded those who complete the courses of the institute.

Statistics on Scandinavian Countries

Statistics on Catholic population of Scandinavian countries has been prepared by St. Ansgar's Scandinavian Catholic League of New York, and published in its annual Bulletin, which is the Jubilee Bulletin for 1910-1950. Although the strongly Lutheran Finland is not usually identified with Scandinavia, the League includes it in its sphere of interest.

Scandinavia, including five nations from the new Republic of Iceland in the west to Finland on the border of Russia in the east, numbers 44,179 Catholics in a population of 17,624,947.

Of these five nations, Denmark, with a population of 3,614,000, has 22,000 Catholics, the largest group of faithful. Next comes Sweden, with 16,000 Catholics in a population of 6,850,000. Norway has 3,980 Catholics in a population of 2,981,000; Finland 1,789 Catholics in a population of 4,052,177, and Iceland 500 in a population of 127,770.

Sven Damsholt, writing in this Bulletin on the Church in Denmark says, "Denmark, you know, is the gateway of Scandinavia to Europe; for that reason we are in closer contact with European currents, and more foreigners come here. As a result Denmark, among the Scandinavian countries, is the first to feel, and most markedly, the ancient faith return in this era when Catholicism is putting forth new shoots everywhere."

He observes that while the Lutheran state church numbers 3,238,349 nominal members, Protestant statistics show that only two per cent of the Danish inhabitants frequent the Protestant churches. He says, "In other words, out of 200 Danes 194 take a more or less vague attitude toward Christianity, four are practicing Protestants and one is Catholic."

The same Bulletin reports that in the Vicariate Apostolic of Sweden the predominant character of the past year's work has been consolidation because Sweden has had the greatest increase in the number of Catholics since the war in Scandinavia. At the end of the war Sweden counted about 6,000 Catholics, but since then their number has increased about 10,000 with the great influx of refugees and foreign workers. There are about 6,000 Sudeten Germans alone in Sweden.

* * * *

DENMARK

New College Opened

The Jesuits have recently opened a college at Copenhagen. It is called the *Niels Steensens College* in memory of the famous bishop converted to the Catholic faith in 1686 whose cause for beatification is now under consideration.

The new college is international in character, with professors of Danish, English, German, Dutch, and Swiss origin. The German Jesuits had maintained a college in the vicinity of Copenhagen from 1873 to 1920. The Jesuits have directed a junior high school in Copenhagen since 1869.

* * * *

FRANCE

"Orthodox" Theological Institute of St. Sergius

A total of 41 students are attending the St. Sergius Theological Institute (dissident Oriental) of Paris this year. They come from the following countries: Germany (3), Finland (1), Greece (3), Russia (15), Serbia (14), Switzerland (1), and Syria (4). Because of the diversity of nationality the courses given in French are completed with some explanations in German and Serbian.

The construction of a new library has been completed—the first new building since the foundation twenty-five years ago. This building was made possible by a special gift from the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. (EPS)

* * * *

HOLLAND

Increase of Catholics in Holland

Census statistics for 1947 show that the Catholics now constitute 38.5 percent. of the population in Holland, whereas they numbered 36.42 percent. in 1930. In a population of 9,625,499 there are now 3,703,572 Catholics. The increase is found especially in the cities of Amsterdam (187,458 out of 803,847) and Rotterdam (153,035 out of 646,248). It is noted that the membership of all Protestant Churches has declined while those belonging to no religious group have increased considerably. The next largest religious denomination is

the Netherlands Reformed Church (34.5 percent. in 1930 and 31.03 percent. in 1947).

* * * *

SPAIN

Centre of Oriental Studies at Madrid

In the near future a Centre of Oriental Studies (C.E.O.) will be opened in Madrid. It will be the Scientific Section of the Institute for Oriental Christian Missions, and will be dependent upon the Sacred Congregation for the Oriental Church at Rome.

This center will be under the direction of Fr. Santiago Morillo, S. J., graduate of Oriental Institute, Rome, who has spent some years in the Orient, and is familiar with the problems which the oriental countries present in spiritual spheres.

The C.E.O. will have the purpose of studying the various religious and cultural aspects of the Orient in such wise that the Orient may be understood in Spain and thus establish a current of sympathy favorable to reunion. The initial programme will contain courses of oriental languages, seminars for the study of special oriental problems, cycles of lectures, and publications.

* * * *

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

State-Controlled Seminary

The Communistic government of Czechoslovakia opened a state-controlled theological seminary in Prague in the month of October. A Mass was celebrated in the presence of Msgr. Antonin Eltschkner, Auxiliary Bishop of Prague, Josef Plojhar, an excommunicated priest, now Minister of Health, and the Mayor of Prague. This seminary, given the name of *Cyrill and Methodius Theological Faculties* replaces all other seminaries of the country.

This seminary, as well as the non-Catholic seminaries, will offer a four year course, the last two of which will be devoted to "theology" taught in the light of Marxist principles.

* * * *

SYRIA

Compromise on State Religion

In August a new formula for Act 3 of the Syrian Constitutions was passed which permits religious freedom. The formula originally proposed read "Islam is the state religion". The act as approved reads: "The religion of the President of the Republic is Islam. The Islamic 'Fikih' is the principal source for legislation. Freedom of belief is preserved. The State respects all the revealed religions and guarantees full liberty of worship on condition that it does not infringe upon public order. The personal state of religious communities is safeguarded and respected." (NC)

CHALDEAN CHURCH

Return of Nestorians

In the past months 36 Nestorians, including two priests and two deacons, were received in the Catholic Church of Chaldean rite. They were received by H. E. Stephan Katcho, Auxiliary Bishop of the Chaldean Patriarch. Since the Nestorians do not use the Sacrament of Confirmation, Bishop Katcho conferred it in the Convent "Dair Al Saida" for Chaldean monks which is located north of Mossul. (Oss. Rom.)

New Chaldean Cathedral

A new Chaldean cathedral was consecrated at Teheran by Patriarch Joseph VII Ghanima of Babylon in July. Ecclesiastical and civic authorities as well as representatives of the diplomatic corps assisted.

Funds for the erection of the Cathedral consisted largely of contributions of American Catholics coming through the Catholic Near East Welfare Association. (NC)

* * * *

JERUSALEM

Project for Reconstructing Shrine of the Holy Sepulchre

Plans have been published for a new monumental edifice to replace the shrine of the Holy Sepulchre which has fallen into such a wretched state of neglect that a forest of provisory support is needed to retard its collapse. The project has been published in a recent book entitled *II Santo Sepolcro, Splendori, Miserie, Speranze* (Arti Grafiche, Bergamo, 1950, pp. 150, 91 illustrations and 30 plates).

The lamentable aspect of the present shrine is an unbearably poignant reminder that the followers of the Holy One whom that monument was intended to honour are now scandalously divided. The intention of reconstructing it may be hailed gratefully as an effort toward reunion in Christ, Who can hardly be thought of without also recalling two of His most cherished desires in our regard—charity and unity.

The project would completely replace the present basilica—built at the time of the Crusades to replace the glorious edifice built by Constantine. Its realization will, however, call upon gigantic efforts of good will and utter devotion to Christ to overcome the hindrances of the *status quo.*

In 1878 the *status quo* was confirmed in the Treaty of Berlin. Already in the eighteenth century the Turkish government had arbitrarily conceded a formal residence and proprietorship of parts of the monument to the Greek, Armenian, and Copt communities, to the detriment of the Latins who were represented by the Franciscan Custody of the Holy Land. Moreover, various other dissident Christian communities had other minor rights and privileges. The *status quo* demands among other things that no initiative of any sort whatsoever be undertaken by any one community without previous accord with all the others. For example, to move an object from one place to another implies recognition of possession on the part of the mover. This applies to those parts which are held in common or are contested. On the other hand, each community

may freely act in his own sector, provided that the others receive similar authorization. Evidently, the result is that no one does anything.

Some time ago lesions were discovered in the dome of the *Katolikon*. The Greeks requested authorization to make repairs. This was in 1922 when the English government had received the Mandate over Palestine from the League of Nations. An examination showed that the Basilica of the Holy Sepulchre was in imminent danger of collapse. Provisory supports have been erected on three different occasions which have added to the hideous spectacle of disfigurement and decay.

His Excellency Gustave Testa, Apostolic Delegate, has taken the initiative in a project for total reconstruction which has been elaborated by the architects Louis Marangoni and Anthony Berluzzi. The Apostolic Delegate's directions dealt with four fundamental points: 1) to establish an ample zone for the emplacement of a new isolated structure which should, in the measure of the possible, follow the lines of the original Constantinian structure; 2) the Greek and Armenian communities should have two distinct churches, but in communication with the Rotonda; 3) the other minor communities should have chapels and suitable accommodations within the walls of the edifice; 4) convents and dwellings should be outside the Basilica, although annexed to it.

The architects have sought to restore certain original characteristics. Entrance to the new *Martyrium* of three naves is had from the *Cardo Maximus* of the city. Behind the apse of this first church, to be placed under the care of the Latins, an area open to the sky is planned as in the original Basilica. This is the Holy Garden in which a shrine encloses Calvary as in an immense reliquary. To the south and north of the area are found the Greek and Armenian churches, respectively. Beyond the Holy Garden is the *Rotonda* of the *Anastasio* which would guard the Holy Sepulchre. Outside the *Rotonda* the churches of Copts, Anglicans, Syrians, and Abyssinians would be built. Surrounding the whole structure is a two-story gallery. Convents and hospices for pilgrims would be provided outside the enclosure.

Book Reviews

Andrew Lansdale Drummond, Ph.D., S.T.M. (Edinburgh): *Story of American Protestantism*: Oliver and Boyd, Ltd. 30 shillings, net. xii plus 418 pp.

Dr. Drummond, a Scot, who has visited America on several occasions and is in contact with many of the more prominent American Protestant theologians, aims in this work "to explain American Protestantism in the light of its past" (p. vi). This task is no easy one, for the sources that gave birth to the various forms of Protestantism in colonial American are widely divergent and with immigration the New World rapidly duplicated all the sects of the Old one. Still Dr. Drummond is well acquainted with the usual varieties of faith, church order, and trend among the numerous denominations and schools-within-denominations in the United States. He tries to treat with equal sympathy the dour Puritan divines, the philosophers of nineteenth-century Transcendentalism, and the new "Liberal" theologians on the current scene. In spite of his enthusiasm about the champions of his earlier chapters, the inflexible Puritans and evangelicals who would be shocked by trends in present-day non-Catholic theology, he leaves us in no doubt as to where his sympathies lie. He has a singular impatience with "conservatism" and traditionalism" in matters of belief, which to him are holding up the fulfilment of the dream of Protestant unity. Though he labors to be objective in matters touching upon the existence of some 23,000,000 Catholics in the United States, he does succumb to the influence of popular fallacies and accepted allegations and feebly writes them off (p. 232) as being "Superficially . . . assimilated to the American way of life" though "culturally", he concludes, Catholicism "lags behind". In his closing chapter he waxes enthusiastic about the "practically undenominational religion" being taught in many colleges, and suggests that students exposed to such teaching will form "a nucleus for non-sectarian Christianity". Whether exposure to the dangerous influences of radical criticism, skepticism, and even frank agnosticism that characterize many such programs would be a desirable price to pay for even superficial unity among American Protestant groups he does not venture to say.

Dunstan Donovan, S. A.

* * * *

Die rechtsstellung des patriarchen der servischen kirche in der kirchenverfassung von 1930-1947 (The Juridical Position of the Patriarchs of the Serbian Church in the Ecclesiastical Constitutions from 1930-1947), by Victor Pospisil; Fb. Hofbuchdruckerei A. Weger, Brixen, 1950, pp. 48.

This work deals, as the title indicates, with the juridic position of the Patriarch of the Serbian Church according to the ecclesiastical constitutions of the years 1930-1947.

The author presents a brief extract from the work with which he obtained his doctoral degree in Canon Law at the Pontifical Gregorian University.

The book is of utmost interest for the scholar, especially for the Catholic who appreciates the problem of the return of the dissident Churches to unity,

in view of the fact that effective progress demands an accurate knowledge of the dissident communities.

Indeed, the Serbian Church—as the author remarks in the preface—has evolved the hierarchico-disciplinary organization of all the dissident Slavic Patriarch, on the other hand, it is difficult, if not impossible to establish juridic-disciplinary, organizational, and constitutional character. There are motives of almost upon the center and heart of the Catholic Church. The Serbian Church has gained more positions from Catholics in the Balkans than any other Pravoslave Church. In the past three centuries it has gained 400,000 Catholics in Jugoslavia and Czechoslovakia. These dissident Serbians are unique in the small number of Catholics among them.

What is the source of the Serbian Church's force and solidity? Who is the motivating figure, the effective head from which it derives the impulse for its activity and organization? Doubtless, we shall find an answer in a study of the fundamental institution of the Patriarchate. In the small treatise which we have before us, the author explains competently and precisely the significance of the Patriarch as Head of the Church, an institution of which, as a rule, the Latins do not possess a clear concept.

Pospisil demonstrates that at the basis of ecclesiastical law in the Serbian Church (Ustav), there is a clear distinction between the Patriarch as Head of the Serbian Church and as President of the Synod. If by virtue of this fact it would appear licit to attribute the title of Supreme Head of the Church to the Patriarch, on the other hand, it is difficult, if not impossible to establish juridically the rather indefinite sphere over which his rights extend.

It is to be hoped that Pospisil's whole work, covering a vast field, and compiled with reliable scholarship as the index and copious bibliography attest, will soon be published. It would be an extremely useful contribution for the sake of exact knowledge from the historico-juridic point of view, of a fundamental institution in the Serbian Church. This is especially the case, since, as it has been observed, the principal motives of division today are apparently not so much of the speculative and dogmatic order as they are of a disciplinary, organizational and constitutional character. There are motives of divergence in the practical and disciplinary order which arise, however, precisely because of the differing doctrinal conceptions and principles which exist between the Churches.

Bruno Prevot

INDEX

ARTICLES

BOYER, S. J., CHARLES,

The Instruction on the "Ecumenical Movement" ..... I, 3
After the "Times" Article ..... I, 28
Imprudent "Irenicism" ..... IV, 263

DE VRIES, S.J.,

The Christian East Today Behind the Iron Curtain ..... II, 105

GILL, S.J., JOSEPH,

The Dissident Orientals and Amsterdam ..... II, 117
The English Pre-Reformation Church ..... III, 185

HERMAN, S.J., EMIL,

Piety, Terrain of Reunion ..... IV, 264

HOFMAN, S.J., GEORGE,

The Idea of the Ecumenical Council as Means of Union in Dealings Between Byzantine and Rome ..... I, 67

JUGIE, A.A., MARTIN,

The Exercise of the Roman Primacy in the Orient at the Time of St. Leo the Great ..... IV, 267

KOROLEVSKIJ, CYRILL,

Some information concerning Societies for Assistance to Catholics of Oriental Rite ..... I,18 – II, 131 – IV, 277

MANGINI, LINO,

Nicholas Cabasilas ..... III, 220

MIHALOVICZ, ZSIGMOND,

Situation of the Church in Hungary ..... I, 6

MONTGOMERY, HUGH,

The Church and Judaism ..... III, 194

MORGAN, S.J., GEORGE A.,

St. Theodore, the Studite, and the Roman Papacy..... III, 207

SEVERIOS, JOSEPH MAR,

The Reunion Movement in Malankara, South India..... III, 201

ZOLLI, EUGENE,

The Truth Will Make You Free..... II, 29

COMMENTS AND DOCUMENTS

BIRCH, JOHN,

An Interesting Question..... II, 142

BOYER, S.J., CHARLES,

A Discourse of the Anglican Archbishop of York..... IV, 297

BUTLER, S.A., SALVATOR,

Some Reactions to the Instruction of the Holy Office on the "Ecumenical Movement"..... III, 151

Paulus, Late (Dissident) Orthodox Archpriest, The "Anglo-Catholic" Situation..... II, 147

PILKINGTON, RONALD,

Importance of Liturgical Worship in England..... II, 148

Texts From Recent Press Discussion on Relations Between Rome and the Christian World..... I, 30

Some Reactions to the Dogma of the Assumption..... IV, 285

The Views of Prof. Alivisatos on the Holy Office's Instruction on the "Ecumenical Movement"..... III, 230

A Protestant Voice on Catholicism and Reunion..... III, 236

Bishop O'Hara's Protest to the Rumanian Government..... III, 237

Instruction to Local Ordinaries About the "Ecumenical Movement"..... I, 51

NEWS

Letter from the Middle East, McMahon, Msgr. Thomas J. ..... I, 57 – 61
The Chair of Unity Octave ..... I, 61 – 65
Ecumenism and Reunion ..... I, 65-67 – II, 163-164 – III, 239 – IV, 303
Algeria ..... II, 177-178
Argentina ..... III, 246
Belgium ..... III, 243
Canada ..... II, 167-169
Chaldean Church ..... IV, 313
Czechoslovakia ..... III, 246 – IV, 312
Denmark ..... IV, 311
Egypt ..... I, 92-94 – III, 255
England ..... I, 80-81 – IV, 308
Eritrea ..... II, 179-180
Finland ..... I, 89 – II, 172-173
France ..... I, 83-87 – III, 244 – IV, 311
Germany ..... I, 81-83 – II, 171 – III, 244
Holland ..... IV, 311
Hungary ..... I, 90
India ..... I, 90-01 – II, 175-177
Italy ..... I, 79-80 – II, 167
Japan ..... II, 179
Jerusalem ..... IV, 313
Lebanon ..... III, 255
Palestine ..... I, 94-97 – III, 253
Poland ..... II, 173-175 – III, 247
Rome ..... I, 76-79 – II, 164-166 – III, 242 – IV, 306
Rumania ..... III, 251
Russia ..... I, 90 – III, 253
Scotland ..... I, 80
South Africa ..... II, 180

Spain ..... I, 88-89 – III, 248 – IV, 312
Sweden ..... II, 171-172 – III, 249
Syria ..... IV, 312
Turkey ..... II, 179 – III, 250
United States ..... I, 87-88 – II, 169-171 – III, 245 – IV, 310

BOOK REVIEWS

CARPENTER, S.C., (S. BUTLER, S.A.)
Winninton-Ingram, The Biography of Arthur Foley Winnington-Ingram I, 98

CARY-ELWES, O.S.B., COLUMBA, (S.BUTLER, S.A.)
Law, Liberty and Love ..... II, 181

DRUMMOND, ANDREW LANSDALE, PH. D., S.T.M. (D. DONOVAN, S.A.)
Story of American Protestantism ..... IV, 315

KING, ARCHDALE, (D. DONOVAN, S.A.)
The Rites of Eastern Christendom ..... III, 256

MIHALOVICZ, ZSIGMOND,
Martire, Non Criminale ..... I, 100

POSPISIL, VICTOR (B. PREVOT)
The Juridical Position of the Patriarchs of the Serbian Church in the Ecclesiastical Constitutions from 1930-1947 ..... IV, 315

SOBORNOST, (D. Donovan, S.A.)
The Journal of the Fellowship of St. Alban and St. Sergius ..... I, 101